

THE COMMUNIST

ALL POWER TO THE WORKERS!

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

Vol. II., No. 6

JUNE 1, 1920

PRICE 5 CENTS

Problems of The Third International

(RAMSEY MACDONALD ON THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL)

By N. LENIN

Number 5423 of the French Social-patriotic paper, "L'Humanité", of April 14, 1919, contains an editorial article from the pen of the well-known leader of the British so-called "Independent Labor Party" (but which in fact has always been an opportunistic party depending upon the bourgeoisie)—Ramsey MacDonald. This article is so typical of the position of those elements characterized as the "centre" and branded as such by the First Congress of the Communist International in Moscow, that we reproduce it in full, together with the editorial introduction of "L'Humanité."

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

By Ramsey MacDonald

Before the war, our friend Ramsey MacDonald was a popular leader of the Labor Party in the House of Commons. As a convinced Socialist and man of principle he deemed it his duty to condemn the war as imperialistic, contrary to those who greeted it as a righteous war. Therefore, after August 4th, he retired from the role of leader of the Labor Party, and, together with his comrades from the Independent Labor Party, together with Keir Hardie, whom we all venerated, and openly declared for war against war.

This required no little degree of heroism from day to day.

MacDonald, by his own example showed that courage, quoting Jaurès—"consists in not obeying the law of Triumphant Lie and not to act as the echo for the applause of fools and hisses of fanatics."

At the elections "by command" * at the end of November MacDonald was defeated by Lloyd George. This need not disturb us—MacDonald will get his revenge, and that, in the very near future. (Editors of "L'Humanité.")

The appearance of separatist tendencies in the national and international policies of Socialism was a misfortune for the whole Socialist movement.

There is nothing wrong, of course, with the fact that shades of opinions and differences in methods exist within Socialism. Our Socialism lies as yet totally in the experimental stage.

Its fundamental principles are established, but the method of their best application, the policies which will bring the triumph of the revolution, the organization of the Socialist State—all these are problems which require discussion and upon which the last word has not yet been said. Only intensive study of all these problems will lead us to the higher truths.

Extremes conflict with each other, and this conflict may assist in the strengthening of Socialist ideas, but the evil begins when everyone considers his opponent as a traitor, as a believer who has been excommunicated and in whose face the gates of the party's heaven should be closed.

When Socialists are permeated by the spirit of dogmatism, as in the early days of Christianity instigated civil war in the name of God and for the destruction of the Devil—the bourgeoisie can sleep peacefully, because the cycle of its rule has not yet been completed, whatever big local and international successes reached by Socialism to the contrary notwithstanding.

Unfortunately, our movement at the present moment is faced with a new obstacle in its path. In Moscow has been established a new International.

Personally, this fact grieves me very deeply—for the Socialist-International at the present time is broad enough to admit of all shades of Social-

* Literally, they were called by soldiers who were ordered to vote for the government's candidate.

ist thought,—and in spite of all theoretical and practical disagreements created in it by Bolshevism, I don't see any reason why its Left Wing should have severed itself from the Centre and formed an independent group.

First of all it should be remembered that we are living as yet in the period of the birth of the revolution. The governmental forms which arose out of political and social devastation created by the war have not yet passed the test, and cannot be considered as finally established.

New brooms sweep wonderfully clean in the beginning, but how they will sweep in the end—there can be no assurance beforehand.

means sufficient to warrant a split within the International.

All Socialist Governments need the assistance and advice of the International. The International should follow their experiments with an attentive and critical eye.

I have just heard from a friend who recently saw Lenin, that nobody subjects the Soviet Government to freer criticism than Lenin himself.

If post-war disorders and revolutions do not justify a split, then is it perhaps that this split finds its justification in the position taken by some Socialist factions during the war? I confess frankly, that here may be found a sounder reason. But even assuming that there is some pretext for splitting the International, then, at any rate, the question at the Moscow Conference was handled improperly.

I am one of those who believe that debates at the Berne Conference on the question of responsibility for the war, were merely a concession to the public opinion of non-Socialist elements.

Not only was it impossible at the Berne Conference to pass a decision on that question which would have some historical value (though it might have some political value), but the question itself was not handled in the proper way.

Condemnation of the German Majority Socialists (condemnation which was fully deserved and to which I fully subscribe), could not be an expression of the causes of the war.

The Berne debates were not accompanied by the frank consideration of the position taken by other Socialists towards the war.

Those debates did not lay down any formula of conduct binding for the Socialists during war. All that has been said by the International up to that time consisted of, that when war takes on the character of national defense, the Socialists should co-operate with other parties.

Under such conditions whom can we condemn? Some of us did not know that those decisions of the International had no real value and could not be applied as a practical guide.

We knew that the war should have ended in the victory of Imperialism and, being neither pacifist or anti-pacifist, in the ordinary meaning of the word, we adopted the policy, which, in our opinion, was the only one compatible with Internationalism. But the International never prescribed such a line of conduct to us.

This is the reason why at the moment the war began the International broke down. It lost its authority and didn't issue a single declaration, on the basis of which we would now have the right to condemn those, who were honestly carrying out the resolutions of the International Congresses.

In view of this it is necessary at present to insist upon the following point of view: Instead of splitting on account of differences about the events of the past, let us build a real active International which will help the Socialist movement during the period of revolution and construction which we may have entered.

It is necessary to restate our Socialist principles, if we cannot come to an agreement on the question of freedom and democracy, if our opinion on conditions under which the proletariat can take power into his own hands will be diametrically in opposition, if finally, it will be proved that the war has poisoned with the poison of Imperialism certain sections of the International, —then the split is possible.

But I don't believe such a misfortune will occur.

(Continued on page 7)

AGENDA FOR THE SECOND CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

- I. Reports:
 - a) C. P. C. and National Secretary.
 - b) International Relations Committee.
 - c) Editorial Committee.
 - d) Defense Committee.
- II. Current Fundamental Problems.
 - a) Present world situation.
 - b) Present situation in the United States.
 - c) Soviet Russia.
 - d) Communist International and Party International Relations.
 - e) Our attitude towards Parliamentarism.
 - f) Mass Action.
 - g) Industrial Unionism and Syndicalism.
 - h) Our Attitude towards Economic, Educational and other Legal Workers' Organizations.
 - i) Workers' Councils Before, During and After the Revolution.
- III. Revision of the Program and Manifesto.
- IV. Organization Problems.
 - a) Communist Party Centralization and Discipline.
 - b) Underground Organization and Its forms.
 - c) Communist Party units and C. P. Shop Committees.
 - d) Functions of Language Federations in the Communist movement of America.
 - e) Propaganda, Agitation and Other Forms of Communist Education.
 - 1) General Propaganda and Agitation.
 - 2) Classes for Propagandists and Other Communist Study Classes.
 - f) Party Press and Literature.
 - 1) Policy.
 - 2) Literary.
 - 3) Technical.
 - g) Communist Unity vs. "Centrist Unity."
 - h) Defense and Relief Work.
- V. Revision of Constitution.
- VI. Resolutions.
- VII. Election of Party Officials.

Russia is not Hungary, Hungary is not France and France is not England and therefore the one who introduces a split into the International taking as a guide the experience of only one nation, demonstrates a criminal narrow-mindedness.

What is the real worth of the experiences of Russia? Who can answer? The Allied Governments are afraid to give us the opportunity for procuring full information. But there are two things which we know.

First of all we know that the revolution was accomplished by the present Russian Government without any preconceived plan. It developed in connection with the trend of events. At the beginning of his fight with Kerensky, Lenin demanded the calling of the Constituent Assembly. Events brought him to the dismissal of this Assembly. When the Socialist Revolution flared up in Russia, nobody suspected that the Soviets would play such an important part in the Government as they did.

Later, Lenin, quite rightly, counseled not to slavishly imitate Russia, but to let the Hungarian Revolution develop freely, according to its own spirit.

The development and variation of those experiences which we are witnessing are by no

THE COMMUNIST

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF

THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF AMERICA

PUBLISHED BY

The Central Executive Committee

VOL. II. JUNE 1, 1920 No. 6

"CONTACT WITH THE MASSES"

We are not yet sure whether the confusion which exists on this question in the ranks of the leaders of the "minority" and the C. L. P. is deliberate or unconscious; perhaps, true to their Centrist character, it is a mixture of both. For, it seems, that the "theoreticians" from those groups both agree in their confusion on this question, and in their attack upon the Communist position, as enunciated by the C. E. C. of the Communist Party of America. In the May 15th issue of the "Communist Labor," a particularly stupid article appeared which, frankly taking the Centrist position, first attacked the S. P. position and then the C. P. ("majority") position. That it failed to do so in both attempts goes without saying. Perhaps that was why the "minority" theoretician came to the rescue in the latest number of the fake "Communist" issued by Damon & Co., in an editorial entitled "Lenin vs. the 'Majority' Group."

There is nothing like trotting out Lenin when you wish to prove yourself an honest-to-good Communist, or, rather, when you wish to prove your opponent is not. With this uppermost in their minds, Damon & Co. carefully search for some phrase or sentence of Lenin which, taken by itself, may tend to prove their point. They tried it in Mass Action, but it proved a boomerang; in this they try it in a second attempt to prove that "contact with the masses" is the expense of sacrificing Communist principles and policies, is in line with the teachings of Lenin. When this fails, no doubt they will try to prove that Lenin also agrees with them on "help branches," or their attitude to syndicalist organizations like the I. W. W., which do not, as yet, accept the basic principles and policies of the Third International. Who knows? Centrists are a peculiar lot, leaning now to the Right and now to the Left, but never long enough in one direction to get on speaking terms with either.

"Principles," then, in any concrete situation, are either to be held in reserve or to be bartered for certain "concessions." Therefore the "minority" take a purely "barter and exchange" point of view with regard to Communist principles and tactics. In the present split with the S. P., their attitude was, sacrifice Communism but get the membership of the S. P.; in the consequent split between the remnants of the Left Wing (C. L. P.) and the Communist Party, the "minority" were and are willing yet to "sacrifice" principles in order to effect immediate "fusion," in the present split between the "majority" and the "minority" of the C. E. C. of the C. P., they "held their principles in reserve," but split on the purely formal ground of refusing to obey a decision of the C. E. C. forsooth, because certain members of the "majority" of the C. E. C. were "crooked," "self-seekers," "international politicians," etc., etc. And as they are developing the cleavage becomes wider and wider.

In this particular editorial of theirs it is instructive to note the manner in which they distort the very basis of the discussion and then go on to prove that Lenin agrees with them. Incidentally, in order to prove that Lenin is diametrically opposed to the "majority," they necessarily distort the position of the latter.

The editorial in question nowhere holds that contact with the masses is to be apured, as the "minority" phrase-mongers try to make out. On the contrary, it points out, sufficiently clear to anyone who has eyes to see and a mind to think with, that contact with the masses is both undesirable and fatal to a Communist Party. We quote:

"The secessionists believe that subscribing to the three basic policies of the Communist Party, Third International, namely, Proletarian Dictatorship, Mass Action and Soviet Power, is sufficient in itself upon which to build a Communist movement in this country. The next step in their opinion, is to procure 'contact with the masses' to give the Communist Party a mass character—to relate it up with the immediate and everyday struggles of the working masses."

"With which we quite agree. The difference comes in when the problem is tackled, when the manner of adapting Communist tactics is applied to the given situation. No Communist is foolish enough to want to keep the party detached and isolated from the masses. That way lies stagnation and failure. The S. P. is a striking example of such decay. But, likewise, one must beware of the danger that lies in trying to come to the masses at a time when the masses—due to apathy and inertia before the full reaction to capitalism—appear to be not receptive to the message of Communism. This is the very rock upon which the Second International was smashed to pieces. This is the lesson which the Third International has learnt—and learning guides its course away from this dangerous shoal."

The above is a real extract from the above editorial, not merely a sentence taken out of its context which may be twisted this way and that by phrase-mongers and adventurers of the type of the Centrists of the "minority group."

Here is predicated the very question at issue between the "majority" and the "minority." Not "contact with the masses" is the issue, but the kind of contact with the masses. The "minority" by deliberately distorting the issue convict themselves of ignorance or wilful deceit, or both.

How can there be any question of the desirability of getting contact with the masses? Why the very organization of the Communist Party, its "illegal" character in the eyes of the law, its underground machinery, its based on secrecy, with a few isolated examples, are workers, class-conscious workers, engaged in industry, and who carry Communist propaganda in the shops, factories and mines. To whom do its leaflets and proclamations go to, if not the masses? For whose consumption is it intended, if not the masses? Every act of a Communist Party is related up to the every day struggles of the masses.

Such a charge against the "majority" is the silliest kind of rot, intended to conceal or ob-

scure the real issue.

We repeat again, for the benefit of the Centrists, the only question at issue is the KIND OF CONTACT WITH THE MASSES. There we disagree, and fundamentally.

We are opposed to that "contact" which implies that the Communist Party must remain silent on the question of "fostering systematically among the masses" the tactics of Mass Action and the "inevitably" of "violent revolution."

We are opposed to that "contact" which implies that the Communist Party should adapt its propaganda to try to in line with the political immaturity, in the pre-revolutionary, propaganda stage of the organization.

We are opposed to that "contact" which implies that the Communist Party should "unite" with elements who only accept the principles of the Third International but refuse to accept its policies; in other words, those who accept principles in words but reject them in action.

We are opposed to that "contact" which implies that "unity" and "large numbers" are necessary and essential in order to have "contact with the masses."

We are opposed to that "contact" which is based upon a fusion with elements who differ with us in principles and tactics.

We pointed out in our editorial in question that this cry of "contact with the masses" was just an American Centrist adaptation of the old social-patriotic cry of "we must not isolate ourselves from the masses." Every compromise, every betrayal perpetrated by the Centrists, mensheviks was always justified on the ground that "we must not isolate ourselves from the masses." We pointed out the danger of such a policy in the Communist movement, and cited some European examples of to-day.

Needless to say, the policy of our Centrists of the "minority" and the C. L. P. is instinct with compromise and opportunism, which must lead eventually to betrayal. They are not seeking "contact with the masses" in order to win them over to Communism. They are seeking "contact with the masses" in order to make Communism palatable to the masses—to "sugar-coat" it. And like their predecessors, the mensheviks, make it palatable to the masses, they are not seeking an anarcho-menshevik, alike to those of them who are opposed to it consciously, as well as to those who do not understand it as yet, but, who, if they did, would have nothing to do with it. And like their predecessors of the Second International the "minority" are already justifying their present conduct and method of propaganda by claiming that they seek "contact with the masses."

As if the C. E. C. does not! But the kind of contact the C. E. C. seeks is that based only upon uncompromising Communist principles and tactics. All other "contact," no matter how nicely it may be camouflaged carries the seeds of compromise, opportunism and betrayal with it.

POLITICAL ADVENTURERS AND CHARLATANS

As the split between the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party and the "minority" develops, more and more proof comes to hand that Damon & Co. are nothing but a set of political adventurers and charlatans, Centrist in character and tendency, and unprincipled in their actions.

One important fact comes to light through the printing of unity negotiations in the "Communist Labor" of May 15, which is the "Communist" of Damon & Co. actions throughout, both before and after the split.

On April 22, the "minority" sent a letter to the C. E. C. requesting the holding of a convention of negotiations, for the purpose of holding a convention of both factions. No mention was made of holding this convention together with the C. L. P. In fact, in this letter, the "minority" stated that on May 5 (both printed in the last issue of the "Communist"), there is only reference to "one party convention." Also, in verbal conversation with our Acting Secretary Bunte, Damon "explicitly" stated in effect, that the split between the C. L. P. may be left out of it. This was the reply to Comrade Bunte's question, relative to the "three corners" convention.

That the above letters were merely so much trash thrown into the eyes of the membership is now definitely proven. They never intended to agree to one party convention—THEY DID NOT WANT TO COME TO CONVENTION WITH THE C. E. C. On April 22, Damon & Co. sent simultaneously a letter to the C. L. P. also requesting the holding of a joint convention in which the inference is contained that the "minority" represents the whole party and that the C. E. C. no longer exists as an official body. To this letter the C. L. P. responded immediately, although two days later, the C. E. C. requesting information regarding the status of the negotiations were entirely ignored. Note what transpired afterwards between the "minority" and the representatives of the C. E. C. and press representatives of the "minority" group as represented by At these conferences agreement was reached not to negotiate with the "majority" group of the C. E. C. of the C. P., the "majority" group of the continue their control in opposition to rank and file desires" (Italics ours).

A most brazen piece of trickery could not be imagined on the part of so-called "Communists." Damon & Co. have evidently taken a leaf out of the book of Lord Grey in his negotiations with Soviet Russia—an olive branch in one hand and a dagger in the other. Obviously, the letter to the C. L. P. was intended to appease those who sided with the "minority," but were never intended to be carried out.

Even assuming the possibility of a three-cornered convention from the "minority" point of view, —the C. E. C. considers this absolutely impossible and impracticable in view of the fact that the Communist Party on principles, and the necessity of clarifying the position both in the convention and in the membership, and the necessity of how could such a "joint convention" be held when the "minority" and the C. L. P. had agreed before the split NOT TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE "MAJORITY" GROUP OF THE C. E. C.?

The only logical conclusion we can draw from this mess of chicanery, lies in the double-dealing that Damon & Co. want to sell out the Communist Party to the C. L. P. effect "unity" even with the "theoreticians" led by Eugene V. Debs" of the social-patriotic type, and blossom out into a united Centrist Party.

This seems to be the name of Communism, the intentions of the Centrist leaders of the "minority" and the C. L. P. having first attempted to win the membership of the C. E. C. over by fraud and deception is further evidenced by an unguarded

INTERNAL AND FOREIGN POLICIES OF ENGLAND*

By KARL RADEK

The English bourgeoisie is preparing for a campaign against the working class. The clearest and most far-sighted bourgeois statesman of England—Lloyd George—understood that not by granting concessions to keep the workers from revolution, and that the bourgeoisie cannot agree to the workers' demands. He understood that any "concessions" granted by the government to the working class at this stage of the movement, becomes a starting point not for steps of one concession, but for the possession of the means of production. If men of the kind of Admiral Fisher, or former Secretary of War, Lord Eldon, are still hoping to hold back the working masses and the assistance of Hendersons, MacDonalds and other leaders of the opportunistic Labor Party—Lloyd George understood that the Labor Party, after having obtained the power would find itself captive of the radical working class elements, which will compel it to go further than it really wants. If some of the liberals still carry the hope of holding the masses back by concessions—the great majority of the bourgeoisie are waiting under the banner of the most merciless resistance to the working class.

The barometer of English social life indicates storm. The magnates of industry are preparing to resist the workers' demands by lockouts, they are organizing White (technical) Guards for breaking up strikes, for service in the necessary state enterprises and in case of great riots, this is openly spoken of in the leading bourgeois papers in London and the question arises whether in English politics consider two possibilities: either all this will lead to an open conflict after a series of economic conflicts—beginning with the general strike, which may take the form of a general battle between Capital and Labor in England, or, at the critical moment of danger in the tendency of concessions will once more gain the upper hand—the Labor Party will take over the helm of government in order to pacify the workers. Only to the extent that the masses leave the opportunistic Labor Party will the issue come to great collisions between the two contending forces.

Which of these two possibilities we consider the more probable does not change the problem in substance. In any case the tendency of class antagonisms in England has developed to such an extent that they speak of revolutions already.

That, being the case, there arises before us the question of the significance of that turn in the foreign policy of England which manifests itself toward Soviet Russia. How can it be explained that at the very moment when the English bourgeoisie is preparing itself for the decisive struggle with her own working class, it should be ready to compromise with the birth-place of a "revolution"—with Soviet Russia? Is it not a contradiction, showing the insincerity of English peace talk? Is not another instance of English cunning? Concerning the question whether the capitalist government of England intends to conclude a permanent peace with us, there is no doubt that we have to deal with a manoeuvre—the English government is not preparing for peaceful relations with Russia. But when we come to the question, not of England's distant plans, but whether it wishes to live in peace with us during the present period of its policy—this question must be answered in the affirmative. There is no doubt that the English Government is trying to come to an agreement with the Soviet Government and to establish peaceful relations with it. This policy by no means contradicts the internal policy of England directed against her working class, but, on the contrary, is closely connected with it. During the struggle of England against Soviet Russia, between the period of the October Revolution and the breaking up of German Imperialism predominated not the social aspect but the desire to crush a power, in which English Imperialism saw a possible ally to German Imperialism. However absurd it should appear, there is no doubt that the English Government had seriously shared the fear of the capture of Russia by German capitalism, with the tact or open connivance of the Soviet Government. The English bourgeoisie did not believe in the permanent rule of the Workers' Socialist regime in Russia. Only when the victory over German Imperialism had freed English Imperialism from those fears, when the end of the war and the

(Continued on page 8.)

* Italics are ours.—Compare this point of view with the similar point of view on the "capitalist peace" with Soviet Russia, expressed by the Amsterdam Bureau of the Third International in several of its statements reprinted in the "Communist," by Comrade Frahm. In his report to the Party (Communist, No. 4) and by Comrade S. Rogers in his letter to Comrade Martens reprinted in this issue, Ed.

admission made by Eugene V. Debs in The Call of May 30, announcing his formal acceptance as presidential candidate on the S. P. ticket: "The extreme Communists denounce me as a traitor. That doesn't matter; I shall not denounce them. I have telegrams from Ruthenberg, Ferguson and Wagenknecht urging me to refuse the nomination. Margaret Prevy was here last week. She did not say what to do, but advised me to do as my conscience dictated."

It would be interesting to know what these telegrams contained for one thing, and when and on whose authority they were sent out for another. Of course, however, we are quite certain that the entire move was a concerted plan to win Debs, and with him the "elect" elements of the S. P. to bolt and join the "united party" of the "minority" of the C. P. and the C. L. P.

Only when this move failed for the time being, did the C. L. P. reluctantly plead with the membership "whose love for Debs overshadows their loyalty to Communist principles" to please leave the party, or they might be expelled. But we notice that "The Toller," official organ of the C. L. P. of Ohio (the home of the C. L. P. though defying the official sanction of their Central Executive body. Of course, we might suggest that the C. E. C. of the C. L. P. should resign, because of the evident divergence of views with their membership (a course that they themselves suggest when such a condition arises in a party), but that would be "rubbing salt into the wound," and so we refrain.

However, the circumstances decidedly tend to prove that this was the real game in the minds of the C. L. P. and the C. E. C., and also explains "minority" and the C. L. P. and the actions of Damon & Co., in pulling away from the C. E. C. and the party just before a convention.

A Significant Letter

(THE LETTER OF S. J. RUTGERS TO L. MARTENS)

Attorney General Palmer, who, in his anxiety to become President of the United States, leaves no stone unturned, made public recently, a copy of a letter from S. J. Rutgers, a member of the Executive Committee of the Amsterdam Bureau of the Third-Communist-International to L. Martens, the head of the Russian Soviet Bureau in America. This copy came into his hands through some mysterious, police-provocateur means.

In view of the fact that the contents of this letter ceased to be a secret, having become immediately upon Palmer's announcement the property of the whole bourgeois press, the Communist deems it permissible and necessary to break the wall of silence on this question, strictly observed by it until now, and to bring this letter to the attention of the comrades. This is all the more necessary because some previous letters from Russia, dealing with the same question in a somewhat different light—more favorable to Comrade Martens—were rather willingly and quickly made public both by Comrade Martens himself and by other official and semi-official and entirely unofficial sources of the Soviet Bureau.

It is not altogether out of place to mention here that not only some letters defending the position of Comrade Martens, but the whole question in its entirety as to the disagreements between Comrade Martens and the revolutionary Socialist organizations in America, long ago, with the able assistance of Comrade Weinstein, became the property of the street. This question was treated and "commented" upon by everybody not only in the pages of the slanderous sheet "The Socialist" (an organ of Gerber, Waldman, Tuvim and Co.) and New York "Pravda" (Russian organ of Weinstein and Co.), but even in the pages of the bourgeois press and in various Government—Senate, Lusk and other committees.

Only the Communist, Novy Mir and other Communist organs consistently maintained silence, because their position on this question was such that they could not deal with this question openly in the only dignified way—on principle and not merely in slandering of personalities—without risking the accusation of "divulging secrets of the Soviet Bureau" or "carrying on counter-revolutionary propaganda..." Now that the question is no longer a secret further silence would have no justification whatever.

For the present we will limit our article to the reprint of Comrade Rutgers' letter with the necessary comment.

This letter is all the more interesting because its author—a noted worker in the International Communist movement, a recent co-worker with Comrade Leon Trotsky in America and together with whom he founded the "Class Struggle," the first revolutionary Socialist magazine in English published in this country, and who later occupied a responsible position in Soviet Russia under the Soviet Government—not only knew Comrade Martens personally but was instrumental in his appointment as the head of the Bureau.

It is unnecessary to add that in this letter, Comrade Rutgers expresses not his personal opinion but the opinions prevalent in the official bodies of the Communist International; not only the official and responsible position of Comrade Rutgers in the Communist International but, as the reader will see further, a resolution on this and allied subjects passed at the recent conference of the Amsterdam Bureau supports this contention.

The following is the letter of Comrade Rutgers, as it appeared in the N. Y. World of April 15th (second morning edition).

The Letter of Comrade Rutgers.

"From your activities it was clearly demonstrated that you consider commercial representation and efforts for recognition paramount. Chicherin and other comrades agreed with this position. Although in nominating you, your capacity as engineer was not even mentioned or thought of. Your supposed clear conception of uncompromising Communist principles decided that you and not Weinstein was preferable.

"As far as commercial relations go, I had the good time of my life, when you started off rattling with millions and arousing some attention and some profit lust. As a beginning it was not a bad stunt but in my opinion you went much too far and were carried away by concentrating on the wrong side of the issue.

"Proposing commercial deals could very well have been left off until conditions could allow actual shipping. Such technicalities do not require much time. As a method to arouse interest in commercial centers, your very presence and some vague rumors about what is required and what can be given in exchange would have been enough; you could never expect to gain more or less detailed negotiations that even from a narrow point of view would arouse special individual interests instead of more general.

"Pressure From the Workers."

The efforts for recognition were of course more important and I understand that this is the crucial point for all your deeds. For I decidedly side with Nic. Hourwich; the main force in

recognition had to be the pressure from the workers.

"All your hope either on small bourgeois individuals or parties like the S. P., artistic and political pacifists and middlemen is not only unfounded but contrary to well-established tactics. You will reply that it was not at all impossible that United States should make peace for capitalistic reasons without any pressure from the workers, and you may even have felt that in a certain situation an (insufficient) pressure to force things was detrimental to a capitalist peace. This, however, I consider opportunism of the worst kind.

"In the first place it is childish to think that if world political considerations caused the United States to make 'peace' your efforts could be of any considerable influence. In such a situation your half-baked radicals would not need your help to support and glorify Wilson, and it would be your duty as I see it, not to canvas Senators, etc., but to mobilize whatever forces there are among the workers to influence the kind of 'peace' and still more to use the situation for strengthening the American movement, because even in such a case ('peace' for purely capitalistic reasons) result of peace depends upon the force of Labor all over the world.

"Peace" may even result in killing the revolution temporarily, if this is the signal for the world proletariat to stop whatever action is under way, for 'peace' means, of course, simply another form of fighting the Soviet Republic to the bitter end, with all crimes imaginable.

"All kinds of neutral diplomatic position looks to be an impossibility and a failure, although the appearance might have to be guarded for utilitarian reasons. But I understand that you did not stick to this position of neutrality and gave your sympathies decidedly more to the 'Centrists' with animosity toward the C. P. I will appreciate to learn more about the leading principles actuating you in these unfortunate conflicts with our most consequent comrades. Although your direct relation is with the Soviet Government, the matter involved no doubt touches the interests of the Communist International.

With best greetings and wishes, yours for the cause."

(Signature of Comrade Rutgers follows.)

The above letter is the final act in the conflict that has been brewing for a long time between Comrade Martens and the revolutionary organizations in America—a conflict which began from the first day of the appointment of Comrade Martens as Soviet representative and which during the early stages was confined to differences between Comrade Martens and Russian revolutionary Socialist organizations in this country and which later developed into a great struggle on principle of supreme importance. Into this struggle were gradually drawn all Left Wing Socialist and later Communist organizations of America; this was the very first source of disagreement and friction within the Left Wing of the American Socialist Party and indirectly, became one of the reasons of its splitting into Communist and "Centrist" camps.

The substance of the struggle on principle, which, during the whole year agitated the ranks of the Russian Communist Federations and the Communist Party of America is well-known to our comrades: it is a question of relations between the organs of proletarian dictatorship—Soviet Government institutions and the Communist International with its organs and branches in the various countries—the spiritual leader and inspirer of the revolutionary proletariat, and which first placed before them, as an immediate practical slogan, the very idea of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

What should be these relations? Comrade Rutgers in his letter says: "For I decidedly side with Nic. Hourwich..." Let us see how this point of view was formulated.

More than a year ago, during the first days after the appointment of Comrade Martens, before he even started his activities, when on the political horizon of the relations between him and local revolutionary Socialist organizations everything was peaceful and harmonious, and there were no indications of future storms, Nicolas Hourwich in an article in the N. Y. Communist, April 19th, 1919 (organ of the

* This struggle is by no means a purely local product developing exclusively under American conditions, and relations, as our slander-specialists would like to represent it. That this struggle has a universal character, based upon principles, whatever the external forms of its expression are—and that it found expression even in Soviet Russia itself—is evidenced in an article by V. Sorin entitled "Communist Party and Soviet Institutions," which first appeared in the Moscow "Communist" and later was reprinted in this country in the Novy Mir and in the Communist. We urge the comrades to reread this very instructive article in the light of this discussion.

Left Wing of the Socialist Party) entitled "Problems of the Representative of Soviet Russia in America" wrote:

"Not for a single moment do we doubt the great importance of the purely 'diplomatic,' so to say, activity here of the Soviet representative. Still less are we inclined to doubt the magic power of the Russian gold—the influence of this gold on the minds and disposition of American plutocracy has already manifested itself in a most obvious manner. But, with all due allowances, giving due justice to all this, we should like to sound a warning to the American workers—and to Comrade Martens himself—against an undue exaggeration of the importance of his purely diplomatic-commercial functions here. We would consider it a fatal mistake if purely diplomatic-commercial 'efforts' become the centre of his activity."

And further: "Comrade Lenin has stated that the final triumph or the ruin of the Proletarian Revolution in Russia depends on WHETHER THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS OF THE PROLETARIAT AND PROLETARIAN REVOLUTIONS IN OTHER COUNTRIES WILL COME TO ITS ASSISTANCE. And in this phrase one finds the KEY FOR THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION!"

"Under present-day political conditions, the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries is the main thing, is the center of gravitation, is everything—both for proletarian Russia and for the emancipation of the proletariat of all the world. The success or failure of the proletarian movement, THE STRENGTH OF THE BOLSHEVIST MOVEMENT, in countries ruled by capitalism, is at the present moment a barometer of the 'favorable,' or openly hostile, attitude of capitalist government towards Soviet Russia."

"The establishment of commercial intercourse between Russia and capitalist countries, with all its intrinsic advantage for the economic life of Russia, is on her side to a certain degree similar to the signing of the Brest Litovsk treaty, merely a means to 'gain time.'"

"All the foregoing, in our opinion, tends to indicate a 'line of behaviour' for the revolutionary, Socialist organizations of the American proletariat, as well as for Comrade Martens as the representative of the Russian Soviet Government."

"The center of his attention, the ever-constant 'compass' directing his activity here, should be the interests of the revolutionary Socialist movement among the American Proletariat, the interests of the advance-guard, the hope and guarantee of the success of that movement—THE LEFT WING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY."

"We are fully aware that in his manifold activities he may not always, or even frequently, be in a position to act UNDER THE BANNER of the Left Wing; but he should take great care that his attitude does not provide 'bait' for the Right and 'Moderate' social organizations, thereby unconsciously to 'stab in the back' the only bulwark and hope of proletarian Russia—those whom it invites to its International Communist Congress—the Left Socialist Wing."

Compare the above-quoted conclusions and recommendations with those formulated a year later in Comrade Rutgers' letter and note the striking similarity...

Comrade Sorin in his article in the Moscow "Communist" previously alluded to, draws the very same conclusions, from an analysis of the very same question in substance, though transplanted from a foreign to what would appear a more favorable soil, Russia itself. But Comrade Sorin formulates his conclusions even more sharply and definitely: "The party, which is comparatively safer from demoralization, should strengthen its control over the Soviet factions and place Soviet officials under its control and supervision... The Communist Party is, always and everywhere, superior to the Soviets."

Such similarity in opinions and conclusions is not a mere coincidence. All these conclusions and opinions, expressed by different people at different times and different places were dictated, essentially, by Communist thought. On this question, this was the only possible Communist conclusions.

A year ago the N. Y. Communist made a "diagnosis" of the situation and prescribed for the "patient," Comrade Martens, just what his political course should be and what "diet" he should follow. A year later, another "physician"—Comrade Rutgers—is compelled to call attention to a serious "disease" which had developed because the "patient" had not followed instructions and "diet" prescribed for him.

Had Comrade Martens followed the Communist advice given to him a year ago, had he guided himself in his activities first and foremost by the interest of the world Communist movement in its entirety,—he would have escaped those fatal mistakes and errors, those humiliations and compromises, which did not help him to accomplish even those very modest and limited aims which he had set out to accomplish, but which, on the contrary, greatly harmed the American Communist movement slinging into his ranks, and into the minds of its members, the greatest disorganization and demoralization. This is exactly what we predicted and we are sure, he is himself convinced of now.

We do not mean to say that if he had adopted the Communist method that his "immediate demands" would have been accomplished by this time. Oh, no! We are far removed from such an assumption! We do not doubt for a single instant that if his (Comrade Martens') activity had been more striking, aggressive (we do not speak of its revolutionary character) and more consistent, if at times,

(Continued on page 8.)

* And certainly to the Soviet Bureau, we must also add.

"Has It Been Worth While?"

"Harold Lord Varney" of the Communist Party
(THE POLITICAL OBITUARY OF Y. F.—"COMMUNIST")
by A—W.

(Continuation.)

To begin with the second part of my article,—we owe an apology to Y. F. In the last issue of the "Communist" we called him a "former editor," which since has proven not to be so. He still continues not only as "theoretical," but also as editor. Having recently resigned (just before the split) from the editorship of the official organ of the Party, he re-united with the "minority" in an editorial capacity the moment they split away from the C. E. C. Anyone who takes upon himself the unpleasant task of looking through No. 5 of the slanderous sheet published by the "minority" group,—which they have the audacity to call "The Communist,"—official organ of the Communist Party of America, to find which, by no means, can and should be confounded with the real "Communist," the authoritative, official organ of the C. P. of A., published by its Central Executive Committee, will be immediately convinced that its (fake "Communist's") actual editor (to distinguish between him and the "Acting Editor") is our "Harold Lord Varney"—Y. F. himself.*

With the exception of a "statement" by D. Damon and a report by L. Fraiha, practically the whole issue is written by Y. F. One article is openly signed by him, another, an unsigned leading editorial article entitled "Communist Party Criticism" is nothing but a mild reprimand (editorials, you know, and especially unsigned ones,—must of necessity be "mild") of the "criticism" contained in the article "Has It Been Worth While?" of which this presentation is an analysis. As to the rest of the articles,—well, we leave it to the reader to decide who wrote them. Of one thing we are certain however,—nobody will be over-anxious to claim their authorship... *

Let us now return to the article in question. Nothing can better illustrate and more conclusively prove our contention that Y. F.'s tendency toward opportunism, his opportunist, purely revisionist attitude toward Communism than his own utterances and pronouncements in reference to the Communist movement in this country in general, and to the Communist Party of America in particular. The general trend of all his utterances and pronouncements is so well familiar to us from the works of Edward Bernstein—"the father of revisionism," and other European revisionist dissatisfaction with and scoffing against, the Party's, and Party leaders' "dogmatism," and what they called "orthodox religiousness." (It is well to remember that the distinction between "orthodox Marxism" and "revisionist Marxism" or "revisionism" dates back to the publication of Edward Bernstein's famous book "Evolutionary Socialism"). In this regard, very characteristic of our author, and very significant, being a typical revisionist statement, is the following citation from the above-named editorial article ("Communist Party Criticism") in the 5th,—but counting from the split, the 2nd,—issue of the fake "Communist":

"In the United States there has been largely an acceptance of Socialist science as a system of dogma and absolute faith, rather than as a method of analysis." (Italics ours.)

The very essence of the "willfulness of a party," which apparently are the main, if not the sole, object of his article and the chief idea of his "criticism," are but another—a "home-made" name for what in Europe has been called "revisionism"...

But we do not even need to go as far as Europe to illustrate the opportunist and revisionist character of our author's utterances and pronouncements. For every statement of his we can quote a parallel, substantially similar in sense and meaning, and often almost exactly worded, statement of some more or less known American revisionist, opportunist, or "revisionist." Our author's spiritual and philosophical affinity to those social-opportunists, and that he thinks and speaks practically in the same terms as they do,—will be conclusively proven to the reader.

Summing up,—the main points in our author's "indictment" against the Communist Party are:

1.—The Party is "orthodox" and "religious." To this accusation he comes back over and over again throughout the whole of his article:

"We have suffered a great deal to the detriment of the Communist movement in this country by the imposition of a religious attitude of fatal inevitability upon the whole process. A few indefinite slogans have served like hallucinations at revival meetings. Hell is being preached to us in all its fearfulness, even more terrifying than the portrayals by Billy Sunday, the hell of being the minutest fraction under one hundred percent Bolshevik."

"The Communists, lo and behold, were the bearers of a new revelation. And ever since the Summer of 1919 we have had an official Communism in the United States which proceeds by incantations, counting of beads, slogans to the East, jubbels of phrases and slogans, pieties unending to Bolshevism—to a Bolshevism consisting of a mysterious compound of words and ritual which could only be known to its high priests!"

*Thus, on its very surface (not to speak of its contents) the fake "Communist" published by the "minority" group,—or, rather, what is nearer the truth,—by "former editor" D. Damon,—carries two lies. Lie No. 1—an announcement that it is the "Official organ of the C. P. of A." What ever one may say with regard to Damon's pretension to still style himself "Executive Secretary of the C. P. of A." or even with regard to his appropriation for expropriation of party funds,—calling the "official" and slanderous sheet published by him "Official Organ of the C. P. of A." is the most shameful, unheard of and brazen lie... Lie No. 2—Damon's signing as "Acting Editor" of the fake "Communist" while his real, actual editor (beginning with No. 5) is Y. F. Perhaps Comrade Kasbeck, who considered it necessary everywhere and on every occasion to officially and publicly announce that he has "nothing to do and nothing in common" with Langley and Y. F., and that he right from the moment of the split refused to come out in company with them,—perhaps Comrade Kasbeck will be better able than anyone else to shed some light on the reasons of concealment from the readers (and we dare to presume, even from the membership of the Party) of the name of the real editor of the fake "Communist." Has it not been "worth while" to conceal the real editor, because, of course, he had made public that his editor is Y. F.—and thus have risked losing not only his membership, but even the last and only "asset" of his—small as it is—"official family"—Comrade Kasbeck?

"The Communist Labor Party came into being alongside the Communist Party as the confused protest of the Left Wing against its absorption into this religiosity of word-Bolshevism..."

...To need to reply to, and refute all this mad, nonsensical prattle of a man, who, apparently "lost his faith," and now,—as in the case with all renegades,—vehemently attacks his former "religion." Do we need to elaborate upon, and prove that what he,—in his intellectual, petty-bourgeois stupidity and inability to understand the working class psychology, judging perhaps by his own psychology while in the Communist Party,—takes for "religiosity" and "religious attitude," is nothing else than the class devotion of class-conscious workmen and workwomen to their cause, to what for them is not simply a "mental" and spiritual self-satisfaction, but the cause of their emancipation from the yoke of capitalism?... Of course not!

"We shall limit ourselves to just one more quotation..."

"...The Socialist Party does not take the theological position as to the unpardonable sin. It is precisely because the Communists insist upon a well-nigh religious orthodoxy as to the mode of revolution; it is because they insisted and still insist that revolution must proceed as it did in Russia, that we have severed relations with them." (N. Y. Call, May 8th, 1920.)

The author of the above quotation is no one else than David P. Berenbaum,—notorious "Right-Winger," former editor of that equally notorious "Socialist," late organ of the "minority group," "Right-Wingers," during their bitter fight against the "Left Wing" in the spring of last year. The reader can see that our "Communist"—Y. F., is in good, respectable company!... We are almost certain that in such company, he will not feel as lonesome as he does among Communists...

2.—Now as to the above-quoted accusation in "dogmatism..."

Here also should be listed his accusations against the Party for its disposition to use the "vaguest sort of phrases" ("jubbels of phrases"), "undefined slogans" and "ready-made principles." This accusation is repeatedly indulged in by all the leading members of the "minority group." Here again our author finds himself in good company:

"The revolutionary phrases and stereotyped dogmas of the past are also insufficient, for the new world cannot be ushered in by brain splitting abstractions." (Helen Fruchter in an article: "Shall We Work or Go on Talking?" in the N. Y. Call of May 25th.)

"The question then was whether the Socialists of America would remain true to the fundamental principle and methods... rejecting the suicidal compromises of the extreme right as well as the sterile revolutionary phrases of the extreme left..." And again: "It is vital and indispensable that our party be preserved... not as a party of mere patch work reforms, or yet as a party of sham revolutionary phrases..." (From the speech of Morris Hilquit at the S. P. Convention.—N. Y. Call, May 8th, 1920.)

"The war is over and we should discard phrases and talk sense... We cannot reach the worker with Marxian phrases..." (Morris Hilquit in opposition to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.—N. Y. Call, May 12th, 1920.)

"We cannot afford to be emotional dogmatists." (Oneal in opposition to Dictatorship of the Proletariat.)

"We should use as few revolutionary phrases as possible. Let us discard the Marxian verbiage that has become so hackneyed by continuous repetition in the last thirty years..." (From an article: "Let Us Drop the Revolutionary Language," by Victor L. Berger.—N. Y. Call, May 9th, 1920.)

So much for "dogmatism" and "phraseology." In his zealous attack upon "hair-splitting doctrinaires" and "revelist talk-spirators," our "Communist" finds himself in company with Morris Hilquit, James Oneal and Victor Berger!... Really, is it not a touching "unity"?

3.—The next accusation is that in its "religious plans and expectations for a 'sound,' 'healthy,' 'analytical' and 'forward-looking' development of the revolutionary Socialist movement in the United States..."

"This 'untimely' revolution, you see,—and for that matter,—not only Russia, but also the German and Hungarian revolutions, have spoiled all the plans and expectations for a 'sound,' 'healthy,' 'analytical' and 'forward-looking' development of the revolutionary Socialist movement in the United States..."

"The adventure element,—with the revolution in process in Russia, in Germany, in Hungary,—was so alluring that none stopped for questioning or analysis..."

The results of these "alluring adventures" were simply "disastrous!"

"A ready-made Bolshevism was super-imposed in this country upon a Left Wing movement of many years standing..."

You see,—that terrible Bolshevism again! Since its ascendancy in Russia, it leaves no one in peace and quiet,—Socialists as well as capitalists,—are compelled to raise their voices against it.

The capitalist press complains that "Bolshevists imposed their will upon the prevailing majority" (from an editorial in N. Y. World, May 31, 1920, on "Debs as a Bolshevik"), meaning "poor, suffering Russia," while our "Communists" of Y. F.'s type, not being so "altruistic," imposed their will upon "their own country," complaining that "Bolshevism was super-imposed in this country..."

Compare both complaints. Is there not a touching similarity in thought and action in language? Truly has it been said that "great minds" run in the same channel!...

4.—"Ritualistic incantations to the Russian Revolution..." "The adventure element,—with revolutions in process in Russia, in Germany, in Hungary..."—such statements demand little more than cursory attention from the reader. The more they are clearer perhaps than anything else, expose the real, common-place, petty-bourgeois, non-revolutionary,—counter-revolutionary, we should say,—position of their author.

All great revolutions,—The Great French Revolution of 1789, the European revolutions of 1848, the Paris Commune Revolution of 1871,—always were and remain the greatest inspirations and lessons for all suppressed and suffering humanity... Marx called revolutions—"the great locomotives of history..." Lenin insisted that we should emphasize the necessity and importance of not only the minutest study, but even the "imitation" of the "learned statesman," Y. F., would call it,—

of the Paris Commune; he himself and the Soviet Government "imitated" it to a very great extent,—especially during the first period, when making first steps in their work, before the Soviet system had been firmly put on "rails" and began to "move by itself..." But our "learned statesman" sees nothing in all these revolutions but "adventure elements," and attempts to study and learn from them he scoffingly and venomously calls "ritualistic incantations!"

Our "political scientist" (this refers to Y. F.—please do not confuse "political scientist" with "international politicians," which, by no means, are the same thing),—our "political scientist," we are sure, will feel himself unjustly accused. "I feel no less Bolshevik than anybody else,"—will he vehemently protest,—"to call me 'anti-revolutionist' is simply ridiculous; I was always, from my very birth, have been and still am for a revolution... as a matter of fact for all kinds of revolutions (even for a 'revolution' within the Communist Party, we hasten to add). What I am against is the 'super-imposition of ready-made Bolshevism' in this country, which is, by no means similar to being opposed to Bolshevism in general..."

If not in the words, he will most certainly use the same language, in effect. Which, of course, suggests a question: what is the difference between a good, "fit-for-Amerika Bolshevism" of Y. F.'s liking,—and a bad, poor species of Bolshevism,—ready-made Bolshevism?

The difference in question is plainly indicated by the very adjective: "ready-made," meaning Bolshevism "made in Russia," and "imported" into this country in a prepared "ready" form... Y. F. does not want such a "ready-made" Bolshevism,—made by others in a different country, in a world of circumstances only dimly akin to those of 1919 in the United States. He has nothing against the name "Bolshevism" (especially because this name has acquired great popularity, promising to bring with it certain adherence and following), but he does not want Bolshevik theory, principles and tactics, built and formulated "in Moscow" to be "super-imposed in this country." He—a "political scientist"—wants to "discover" a world of necessary, to "invent," to build and formulate them over again himself; he wants his own, "home-made" theories, his own "American brand of Communism," preserving only, because of its usefulness and practicability, a "foreign" name.

He is, in this respect, not unlike Hilquit, Oneal and other "stars" of the S. P., who "are willing" to affiliate with the Third International, but do not want the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and other theories "coined" in Moscow to be imposed on them... He is even not unlike Victor Berger, who, in the above-quoted article "Let us Drop the Revolutionary Jargon," expresses the same "thoughts," strangely enough, in a "foreign" most identical language: Says Victor Berger:

"In order to accomplish anything at all we must cease to gaze upon Russia exclusively. We cannot transplant Russia to America..."

For the new developments in Socialism—for models to pattern after—we must not look to Russia...

"We cannot imitate Lenin..."

Yes, our "learned statesman" truly belongs to those "Centrists" of whom Lenin speaks in his article—"Problems of the Third International," the publication of which begins in this issue of the "Communist," when he says:

"The most dangerous,—coming from the Bernad International—is the Lip-service recognition of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (Italics ours.) These men are apt to recognize anything and sign anything only in order to remain at the head of the working class movement. Kautsky already says that he is not opposed to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. French social-patriots and 'Centrists' also sign under the resolution for Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

"They do not deserve any confidence. (Italics ours.)"

"They recognize the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in words, in order secretly to read into it the will of the majority." (General summary of the resolutions of the Second International, against these new tricks, against these new hockeys of reformism, more than anything else...) (Italics ours.)

The political identity of Y. F. and of all those who stood and stand with him now,—is now clear to us.

He is a typical "Left Winger," which term he himself uses and prefers to the term "Centrist" for a definition of his political position.

The creation and extension of the "Left Wing" was a good and positive sign at the death-bed of the Second International; it still is such in a country where a Communist Party has not yet been organized, presaging its formation in the near future.

The "Left Wing," in other words, belongs to and represents the transitory period from the Socialism to the Communist Internationalism.

But when and where a Communist Party has already been organized, or speaking generally,—in the epoch when the Communist International has been organized and begun functioning,—the "Left Wing" most certainly represents a backward stage of development, composed of the indecisive, hesitating, wavering, backward elements, who left the rotten corpse of the Second International, but still their professions to the contrary notwithstanding,—cannot join the Third International full-heartedly, without open or mental "reservations"...

Quoting Lenin (see his "Greetings to Communists Abroad" in the International Supplement) to this issue of the "Communist"):

"The Left Wing combines the unimaginative, cowardly old prejudices of the petty-bourgeois, petty-bourgeoisie regarding parliamentary democracy, with the Communist recognition of the proletarian revolution, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Soviet power."

Exactly this "unimaginative, cowardly and petty-bourgeois" Left Wing, our "learned author" Y. F. represents. His sympathies are all on the side of the Left Wing. Toward Bolshevism or Communism he has no prevailing sense of realism; he feels nothing but "old prejudices" and repulsion.

He repeatedly and expressly indicates this throughout the whole of his article. Bolshevism is to him "a mysterious compound of words and phrases and ritual which could only be known to its high priests..." "The Communists, lo and behold,—sarcastically and ridiculously remarks,—were the bearers of a new revelation..." He feels really hurt and indignant at the "discovery" that the "Communists were not the Left Wingers of the Socialist Party," but spurns this "discovery" along with the rest of the Socialist Party!...

On the other hand, he, with an obvious and warm sympathy speaks of the "protest of the Left Wing against its absorption into this religiosity of word-

"Meaning, of course, all those who in spirit belong to the Bernad International," with its traditional rule of letting each country retain its own autonomy and right to determine its own policies,—which has since been proven so fatal...

International Supplement of THE COMMUNIST

Vol. II, Supplement to No. 6.

JUNE 1, 1920.

Greetings to Communists Abroad

A Letter From N. LENIN

News from abroad is scarce and scanty. The blockade by the world imperialist forces, strangling us, and all the forces of the most powerful nations of the world are used against us for the re-establishment of the exploiters. The fierce hatred which the capitalists of Russia and of the entire world feel towards the Soviet Republic is camouflaged by high-sounding phrases about the "real democracy."

The fraternity of exploiters is true to its own traditions: it represents bourgeois democracy to be the "democracy," and it includes all the Philistines, including Messrs. Adler, Kautzky, and the majority of the leaders of the "independent social-democratic party" of Germany, which is independent of the revolutionary proletariat, but dependent on petty bourgeois prejudices.

The scarier the news from abroad, the greater is our joy in Russia at the universal and gigantic successes of Communism among the workers of all lands, and at the severance by the masses of all ties with the treacherous leaders, who, from Scheidemann down to Kautzky, have gone over to the bourgeoisie.

All we know of the Italian Socialist Party is—that the Congress has decided by an overwhelming majority to adhere to the Third International, and to adopt the program of the proletarian dictatorship. Thus, the Italian Socialist Party has actually become Communist, although, unfortunately, it has retained the old name. We send out a hearty welcome to the Italian workers and their party.

All we know about France is—that Paris alone has already two Communist papers: "The International," edited by Raymond Pericat, and "Le Nom Défendu," edited by Georges Anquetille. Several proletarian organizations have joined the Third International. Evidently the working masses are on the side of Communism and the Soviet Power.

As to the German Communists, we have learnt that a number of towns possess Communist newspapers, most of which bear the title "The Red Flag." The Berlin "Red Flag" has an illegal existence, and is having a heroic contest with the butchers Scheidemann and Noske, who are rendering flunky service to the bourgeoisie by their acts, as do the independents by their words and by their propaganda of petty ideas.

We are full of admiration and enthusiasm for the heroic stand made by the Berlin "Red Flag," which shows that there are honest and sincere Socialists in Germany who remain firm, and refuse to be cowed, in spite of persecution and the foul murder of their best leaders. Communist workers in Germany are striving on a heroic struggle worthy to be called really "revolutionary." At last the German proletariat has given birth to forces to whom the words "proletarian revolution" have become a reality.

We send our greetings to the German Communists!

The Scheidemanns, and Kautzky, the Renners and Friedrich Adlers, have shown themselves as traitors and betrayers of Socialism, and partisans of the bourgeoisie. They all signed the Basel manifesto in 1912 on the impending imperialist war. They all talked, then of the "proletarian revolution," and all proved to be in reality nothing but small-bourgeois democrats, knights of bourgeois-republican and bourgeois-democratic illusions and helpers of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

The fierce persecution of the German Communists has made them more determined. If, at the present time, they are to a certain extent disunited, this only bears witness to the broadness and the mass character of their movement, and to the growth of Communism in the very heart of the working masses. Disunion is inevitable in a movement which is being so fiercely persecuted by the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and its lackeys, Scheidemann-Noske, and which is compelled to organize "illegally."

It is also only natural that a movement which is growing so rapidly in the midst of persecution should engender sharp dissensions. There is nothing alarming in this; those are only growing pains.

Let the Scheidemanns and Kautzky's express malicious joy in the "Vorwaerts" and the "Freiheit" at dissensions among the Communists. These heroes of a decomposing small bourgeoisie are reduced to covering up their own rottenness by sneers at the Communists. They deliberately blind can refuse to recognize the real truth about the situation in Germany, which is the shameful betrayal of the proletarian revolution by the Scheidemanns and Kautzky, who have sided with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

Heinrich Laufenberg, in his admirable pamphlet "Between the First and Second Revolution," has proved and substantiated this fact with remarkable clearness of judgement. Dissensions amongst the followers of Scheidemann and Kautzky are the dissensions of decomposing and dying parties which possess leaders without followers, generals without armies.

The masses are leaving the Scheidemanns, and are going over to the Kautzky, because of the Left wing of the latter. This is evident from the perusal of any report of the mass meeting. The Left wing combines the unimaginative, cowardly old prejudices of the small, petty, petty bourgeoisie regarding parliamentary democracy, with the Communist recognition of the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the Soviet Power.

It is only under the pressure of the masses that the worthless leaders of the "Independents" pay lip service to all this, for in reality they remain small-bourgeois democrats of the type of Louis Blanc and other foolish dreamers of 1848, whom Marx so mercilessly branded and ridiculed.

All these dissensions are quite irreconcilable. There can be no peace between proletarian revolutionaries and the small bourgeoisie, which, like its proto-type of 1848, worships bourgeois democracy, oblivious of the latter's bourgeois character. These two cannot work together. Haase and Kautzky, Friedrich Adler and Otto Bauer, may twist and turn, they may fill reams of paper and deliver no end of speeches, but the fact remains that, in reality, they are incapable of understanding the dictatorship of proletariat and the Soviet Power, and that they are nothing but small-bourgeois democrats. "Socialists" à la Louis Blanc and Ledru Rollain. In fact they are, in the best case, tools in the hand of the bourgeoisie, and in the worst—its conscious lackeys.

The "Independents," the followers of Kautzky and the Austrian Social-Democrats, are seemingly a united party, but in reality a large proportion of the members disagree with the leaders on everything which is essential. These members will engage in the proletarian, revolutionary struggle for Soviet power as soon as a new crisis arises, but the leaders will remain then, as now, counter-revolutionaries. Verbally, it is not difficult to sit between two stools, and Hilferding in Germany, and Friedrich Adler in Austria, are proving themselves past masters in this art.

However, in the thick of the revolutionary struggle, people who try to reconcile the irreconcilable will be like so many soap-bubbles. The "Socialist" heroes of 1848 proved themselves to be such, and the same may be said of their brothers—the Mensheviks and social-revolutionaries in Russia in 1917-19, and of the Knights of the Berne yellow Second International.

The dissensions of the Communists are of a different nature, and it is only the wantonly blind who cannot see the fundamental difference. Those are the dissensions among the representatives of a mass movement of a remarkably quick growth. Those are dissensions which have a common, solid, fundamental basis: the recognition of the proletarian dictatorship and Soviet power.

On such a basis dissensions have no terror: they are growing pains and not senile decay. Bolshevism has also experienced dissensions of this kind and splits in the Party on account of them, but when the decisive moment came for the conquest of power and the establishment of a Soviet republic, Bolshevism became united. It attracted all the best elements of Socialist thought, nearest to it in conception, and gathered around itself the entire vanguard of the proletariat and a gigantic majority of the workers.

The same thing will happen to the German Communists.

(From "Workers' Dreadnought.")

(To be continued.)

Greetings to American Communists

FROM THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BUREAU OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Amsterdam, March 20th.

Comrades:

We have learned with utmost indignation how ruthlessly the ruling class of America is persecuting you. The brutality with which it strikes at the best workers for the cause, flogs and tortures, imprisons and deports hundreds of brave men and women, fills our hearts with the same bitter feeling of being powerless to assist you against your cruel oppressors, as we so often experienced when, in former days, the sad stories reached us of the suffering of the Russian revolutionaries.

But at the same time, the heroic way in which you are bearing up under the blow, fills us with admiration and with confidence in the future of the American working class. We know you are as yet only a vanguard; we know how American capitalism, by combining the brutality of the former Russian autocracy with the hypocrisy that is the proper gift of the Anglo-Saxon bourgeoisie, has succeeded till now in misleading the masses of the workers.

But we also know that persecutions have always been in the great epochs of the proletarian class-struggle "the seed of the church." So it was with Chartism, so after the promulgation of the anti-socialist law in Germany under the rule of Bismarck; so in Russia after the terrible reaction of the years 1907-1910. Socialism always arose triumphant out of all persecutions. And so will Communism in our own days. Far from striking fear in the hearts of the fighters pledged to the revolution, the White Terror in America will arouse in thousands of workers a new consciousness of the realities of the class war, and the true nature of bourgeois democracy. It will turn the thought of thousands and thousands to the principles of Communism and make them realize that there is neither freedom, nor justice, nor any hope of a better life for the masses as

long as the capitalist class owns and controls the machinery of production.

The Social Revolution is making great strides in Europe; the light that has arisen in Russia floods the West; the ideas of the mass-struggle, the Soviet-system, and the dictatorship of the proletariat as means of realizing the reorganization of production on Communist lines gain daily in strength and sweep onward like an irresistible flood. In the whole of Central Europe capitalism is waiting for its deathblow; in the Latin countries—France, Italy and Spain—it is considerably weakened, being undermined by economical and political difficulties. Till now Anglo-American Capitalism stands almost unshaken, powerful and strong. Great Britain still relies on her colonial empire; she hopes to be able to avert the revolution by affording to the masses some slight betterment of their lot by lightening their chains a little through the exploitation of hundreds of millions of their brethren of the colored races. Well, we think these hopes will soon be disappointed. Revolt already raises its head in Egypt and in the Indies. As for the United States, the employing classes hope to retain their power by widening the chasm between a small aristocracy of labor, led by treacherous leaders, and the masses of the workers. They hope to retain it by fooling and bying the minority, by coercing and victimizing the vanguard of the masses.

It is the glorious task of the American Communism to carry on, on broader lines the task that the I. W. W. first took in hand, to lead the masses to the assault of capitalism; to become the nucleus, the heart and the brain, of a strong and determined working-class movement.

The arising of such a movement is of the utmost importance for International Communism and for the cause of the Social Revolution. We all know that the world revolution cannot triumph,

as long as Anglo-American capitalism remains in power, and we have reason to believe that the decisive struggle between capitalism and Communism will be waged on the American continent. Nothing short of the fall of American capitalism will mean the end of that gigantic historical drama of which the world war seems to have been the prologue. The ruling classes of America know this, and that is why they crush Communism before it has deeply struck root into the American soil. But you, comrades, will not let them commit this crime; you will not let them destroy your organization or compel you to desert it; you will find ways and means to shift your methods of action, you will place your organization beyond the reach of your enemies and carry on, undaunted, the agitation amongst the masses. You will rally these to the flag of Communism, that is of world-wide, uncompromising class-war. And when the economic crisis that is spreading over the world, reaches your country,—when the revolutionary storm, kept back neither by mountain ranges nor broad oceans, rages over the American continent,—when millions of starving workers no longer, like in former times, cry out for bread, but fight for power, then you will lead the way to the general attack on the capitalist system. Your persecutions, your martyrdom to-day, your heroic struggle against fearful odds, all of this will design you for leaders of the masses just as the fortitude and determination of the Russian Bolsheviks designed them to take the lead in the revolutionary struggle of 1917.

Yours for the International Revolution
The Executive Committee of the Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of The Communist International,

D. J. Wynkoop.
S. J. Rutgers.
Henriette Roland Holst.

Political Parties in Great Britain

REPORT TO THE AMSTERDAM SUB-B

Political assimilation is proceeding in Britain with a rapidity and momentum that is remarkable in view of the vast and intricate machinery through which energy and initiative are being poured into the country. It can be dissipated and crises forestalled. Social patriotism reached its climax during the war. It had swamped almost every section of the community. Even large numbers of those who had been professional pacifist and anti-war were in fact social patriots. The class war was forgotten by the working class except by a few to whom we shall refer later. The political content of the country was reflected by the popular press.

Tories or Conservatives—Tory Party. Liberalism—Liberal Party. Labor—Labor Party (Trade Unions, Fabians, I. L. P., B. S. P., Co-Operative Societies).

Labor—outside the Labor Party: Socialist Labor Party, South Wales Socialists, Workers Soc. Federation, Socialist Party G. B., Anarchist groups, Guild Socialist groups.

The two parties, Tory and Liberal, reflect respectively the Landed, Financial and manufacturing interests. Labor and Socialist Parties reflect proletarian interest, both agrarian and industrial.

The Labor Party is, at young, the 1906 elections having marked its definite advent into British politics and indicated the proletarian drift away from the Tory and Liberal parties, the latter having prided itself for many years for its capacity to express the interests of the workers as well as the capitalists. It is a peculiar conglomeration of persons and interests and parties which has led to much confusion in estimating its capacity to express proletarian interests.

Its primary action was to gather together all the elements which could lay claim to be focussing the workers' interests in the labor movement. In union form, the organization was loose of necessity and its platform equally indefinite. Hence in actual experience it is dominated by the heavyweights of the labor movement, the few important trade unions are affiliated and put forward candidates at elections under the Labor Party auspices. It has thus in spite of what may be said to the contrary, been able to become the political reflex of trade unionism. The intense development of the last few years has compelled it to shape a policy and program which now overtops the efforts of the political party elements such as the F. and B. S. P.

Its program is essentially a reformist program, aiming at state control under capitalism, the development of the political democracy of capitalism and the industrial democracy of joint control by workers and capitalists. It supports the League of Nations and is allied with the Second International. It has a public utility service, the abolition of capitalism, whilst the capitalists look to its deeds to save them from their disaster. In its early days the I. L. P. leaders such as Keir Hardie, Mac Donald and Snowden dominated the party. As it grew in strength trade union leaders such as Henderson, Clynes, Thomas took their place. These are

It has not become a party with machinery equal to the times. The party machinery of Liberalism and as it is informed by the ideas of the leadership of the old Liberal Party the voice of revolt within it but serves to stimulate and strengthen the hands of the reactionaries who lead the party. The movement of the middle class is not the movement of the adjustment of the Labor Party machinery to accept them are indicative of the reaction upon the petty bourgeoisie and labor driving them from the coalition of the minor parties which was formed for the conduct of the war.

In that coalition all Liberalism was lost by the centralizing and oligarchical control demanded by the military. After the climax of nationalism of social patriotism had been reached in 1916, labor began to assert itself, and at the close of the conflict became more manifest in the internal affairs of the nation. The Labor Party was compelled to move away from the coalition. It moved not with a clear class-conscious purpose, but under pressure with all the liberalism of the traditional trade unionism. Hence, Liberalism has been completely overwhelmed by the war, the Labor Party appears to be the only refuge of the lower middle class in the cessation of hostilities with the Central Powers and

In order to abolish classes—a period of the dictatorship of one class is necessary, precisely the rule of the oppressed classes, which is able not only to overthrow the classes which is able not only to suppress their resistance, but also—to free themselves mentally from all the bourgeois-democratic ideology, from all the phrase-mongering about liberty and equality in the abstract. (In this sense, as Marx has shown, this phrase-mongering designates the "liberty and equality" of the owners of commodities, not the "liberty and equality" of the workers.)

What is more, on the **dictatorial** and **Voreck-** class is able to destroy class of the oppressed which is trained, united, hardened by the dictatorship of capital—only that class which has mastered all the urban, industrial and big-city life, which has the resoluteness and ability to resist all research, and even to further all its conquests, workers, only that class which all people, all the hardships, reverses, and sacrifices, and make those enormous sacrifices invariably break forever with the past and of those who clear the path for a new future; only that class, which is the only class exempt for all the petty-bourgeois hatred and conventional qualities flourish among the philistine—only that class which has "passed the intellectual" only that labor and can impress respect, hardening school of

... upon every toiler, upon every honest man
Comrades, Hungarian workers, you gave the
world a better example than Soviet Russia in
the way you were able to unite at once all the
socialists on a platform of real proletarian dic-
tatorship. Ahead of you is the severest task
of all—to defend it in a terrific war.

But firms! If swerving will appear among the capitalists who have previously joined with you in the Dictatorship of the proletariat, or, among the petty-bourgeoisie—suppress these swerving pitilessly. To be shot—is the fate of the swerving!

You are leading the only legitimate, just, real, revolutionary war—the war of the oppressed against the oppressors, the war of the workers against the exploiters, a war for the story of the future. All over the world, everyone that is honest in the working class, is on your side. Every month brings the universal proletarian that is revolution nearer.

Meanwhile the same intensification of the class struggle has had its effects upon other parties. The I. L. P., the largest of the Socialist parties, the largest pacifist in the movement. Its lack of clarity in its reaction to the economic lead it to social patriotism in its reaction. Traditionally reformist in character in its leaders are strenuously endeavouring to lead it in the direction of the Labor Party, while the increasing intensity of the class struggle and the lessons of the revolution in Europe are driving the rank and file towards the Third International. In this rank and file there is a great danger of an organized body accepting new principles whilst their leaders think in terms of the old.

and 5. Its most important change occurs subsequent to the Russian revolution. Up to this time it had carried with it the traditions of parliamentary democracy from the 18th and 19th centuries and was distinguished from the left by the latter being not so much because it possessed an alternative theory of organization, as opposition to the idea of building organizations on the basis of the traditional model. The conference of 1918 showed a greater sympathy to Industrial Unionism, whilst the national conference move towards the Third International led to the resignation of its left wing. The conference's move towards a revolutionary policy both in personnel and tactics than at any time in its history. Its membership is estimated to be about

Formed in 1903 it has steadily and persistently focussed the class struggle, revolutionary parliamentarism and industrial unionism, following on the lines of De Leon of America. It has never been out of the line of the class struggle in America, and in every Socialist party in the country. It has its own press from which has emanated much good work. Vigorous and uncompromising, a pioneer of revolutionary educational classes, its lecturers have been among the best in America, and its speakers alike. It had least to adjust when actual revolution compelled all parties to review their policy and practice. Even prior to the great event of 1917, it had made a complete re-orientation of its platform for the new orientation of the party, well suited to the conditions of Britain. It ran candidates in the 1918 elections on a Soviet program. It is affiliated to the Third International, its center is Glasgow.

The South Wales Socialist Society is a small party akin to the W. S. F. and accepts the same principles and policy.

The Guild Socialist Groups are also doing much propaganda for industrial unionism, whilst their theories, particularly in relation to the State, are receiving much sympathetic attention in the I. L. L. Union of the organizations enumerated with the exception of the W. S. S. have their own parties. The I. L. P.—"The Industrial Laborer," the P. S. P.—"The Call," the S. L. P.—"The Socialist," the Workers Socialist Federation—"The Workers Dreadnought," the S. P. of Gr. B.—"The Socialist Standard," the Guild Socialist—"The Guildsmen."

During the beginning of 1919 there have been efforts to fuse together some of these parties together into a Communist Party.

Later the S. L. P., B. S. P., W. S. F. and S. W. S. have met in conference several times and have arrived at an agreement to the Third International, dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviets. But disagree on parliamentarism and affiliation to the labor party.

A recommendation from a recent unity conference to the effect that there should be a Communist Party formed on the basis of things agreed upon and the points of difference on the L. P. be submitted to a ballot three months after the party has been formed, has resulted in the S. L. P. refusing to accept the proposition of a vote on affiliation the L. P. even after the three months referred to. The B. S. P. result is not yet declared, though it is anticipated the party will vote in favor.

The intensification of the conflict and the extended propaganda following the Russian Revolution has had its effect on the I. L. P. in spite of its official declaration at the Scottish Conference of January 1920 declared in favor of the Third International. It is doubtful whether this will be ratified by the annual conference of the party. If the Second International move will be made away from the Longueuil hall.

summing up the position therefore we find the demonstration of the line becoming more clearly defined in politics as in industry. The latter is clothed in social patriotism: the British Labor Party being overwhelmed by the trade-unions and the Chinese the Socialist parties into the background, while the Socialist parties move steadily upwards revolutionary left. In this movement, with and fully reflecting the same tendencies in industry

(Continued on PAGE 4.)

(Continued on page 4.)

PEACE WITH RUSSIA

MAY 1st PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BUREAU OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

STRIKE ON MAY DAY 1920!
Peace with Russia! What does it mean?
Is there such a thing as peace between a Soviet Republic and World Capitalism?

No! A real peace is impossible under capitalism. A real peace for Russia means the victory of the world revolution and nothing else.
Therefore, revolutionary action of the Workers to force peace has to be a struggle to develop power to such a degree, that World Capitalism will be prevented from making war upon Russia in one form or another.

First, open warfare must be stopped, by refusing not only to fight, but also to make or transport arms, munitions, equipment, etc., for those who might use them to fight Soviet Russia.

Second, the Workers must prevent and counteract all machination, plotting and underground action against our proletarian comrades, or exposing those responsible for it. By preventing money to be expended in such work and by not believing any of the lies in the capitalist press. This latter is very important. If we pledge ourselves not to believe any capitalist statements with regard to Soviet Russia, any report about alleged barbarities, any so-called facts about internal troubles and chaos or external policy of conquest, etc., we are not likely to be fooled again just as most of us were fooled in 1914.

Third, to strive in other countries towards Soviet Republics as the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This inspiring aim we must always bear in mind, in all our deeds, all our actions. We must fill our minds with revolutionary thoughts—we must dare to hope in the midst of our misery—we must understand more and more that the breakdown of capitalism is a full process, we must be willing to destroy the weapons of our enemies, we must have confidence in our constructive power. All this we can achieve in a constant fight with our exploiters by giving this fight a general revolutionary character. It means a complete break with bourgeois civilization, bourgeois morals, bourgeois supremacy.—IT MEANS LABOR AS THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF SOCIAL AND MORAL LIFE.

What about the peace proposals of the enemies of Labor?

They have become methods to destroy Soviet Russia from within and may be supplemented at any time by methods from without, if the workers should weaken for a moment. Russia is willing to accept such a peace, knowing full well what it means. But they need railway material and machines so badly they are willing to take a chance upon intrigue, corruption, counter-revolutionary plots and murder, confident that the workers in Western Europe will draw power from a closer contact with the Russian Revolution, confident that capitalism will break down before it can strengthen itself from the treasures of the Russian soil.

Russia must feed Europe, must supply it with the most valuable raw materials and it will, no doubt, give some immediate relief to the exhausted nations of Central Europe. Even from this narrow point of view, peace with Russia is in the direct interests of the workers. But if a capitulation to Soviet Russia really meant the recuperation of capitalism throughout Europe, this would be detrimental to the interests both of Soviet Russia and the Workers' Revolution. We are confident that the relief will be of such a character that it will not give capitalism a new chance for temporary recovery and preparations for a new world war, that it will come too late anyhow. It is our duty and our only salvation to back up Russia by our actions to such an extent, that it can secure a peace that will strengthen the first proletarian state more than it will her enemies.

If a new attack is forthcoming, we have to fight this new crime. If peace is on the way we have to fight even harder, for the result will depend upon the kind of peace and the willingness of the workers to use this temporary truce for their own revolutionary purposes. And remember well: What is true for Russia, today, may become true for Soviet Germany or any other Soviet Republic tomorrow.

Therefore, under all circumstances, the action to support Soviet Russia must be unpermeable in our minds, must form part of all our proletarian action. And to make it clear to the world, this is a paramount international issue, the idea of an international demonstration strike must be propagated and prepared in all countries.

Such a demonstration cannot be successful unless the class struggle creates and intensifies a feeling of international solidarity, unless in all our mass movements we include Peace with Russia in our

demands. But even when incomplete, a demonstration for a workers' peace with Russia contributes towards strengthening the forces of internationalism.

The Amsterdam Bureau of the Communist International considers it its main task to further international unity, not only of thought but of action as well. It therefore submits for consideration to all Communist groups and revolutionary organizations, workers' committees, etc., the possibility of a DEMONSTRATION STRIKE in favor of peace with Soviet Russia on an international scale.
The First of May was always intended to be a day of general strike, the world over, but till now it never succeeded in realizing the general revolutionary character that its promoters wanted it to bear. On the contrary, in the last decade before the war, the First of May more and more lost all revolutionary significance. Capital did not feel any threat to its existence in the parades and demonstrations held that day by millions and millions of people, and the bourgeois state incorporated these demonstrations in its normal life, like it did trades-unions, the Social-Democratic parties, etc.

To the Third International has fallen the historical task to perform a revolutionary transformation only planned—to realize the visions that its predecessors only talked about. It is bound to realize internally and externally, the international unity of the world-proletariat, its unity of doctrine, of organization and of action. The international movement to form a world-front that imperialism is already developing despite of its internal deviations and dissensions.

In suggesting, that in 1920, the First of May be used for an international demonstration strike in favor of Soviet Russia (no matter whether at that time the imperialists talk peace and plan war) we want to avail ourselves of the traditions of working-class solidarity and action in favor of peace, already attached to the MAY DAY, and to use these traditions as a means of bringing on a new vigorous effort in the direction of international unity of action. We think the times are ripe for an effort of this kind.

To a superficial observer, the revolutionary struggle in Central and Western Europe may seem developing with the utmost slowness, or is even brought to a standstill, but if we look more closely and below the surface, we cannot but wonder at the tremendous changes going on in the minds and souls of millions and millions of men and women all over the earth—changes developing with the utmost rapidity. Thus, they believe that the fatal, immutable, everlasting domination of Capital is being shattered day by day. The idea of new forms of human life, of general comradeship and culture for all, and the common ownership of the means of production presents itself as an approaching reality for the first time since society was divided into a dominating and a dominated class—for the first time it takes hold of the masses. The outward facade of the capitalist system still exists, but it may fall to pieces at any moment, although a long and severe struggle will doubtless still be necessary, as much to finally crush the bourgeoisie as to effectuate in the mass of the people the moral and intellectual transformation that will make them able to institute the Communist Commonwealth, and render them fit to live in it.

All the same, we must always keep before our minds the fact of the enormous changes going on below the surface of the present world, confined that any little thing, some minor circumstance may now, at any moment cause the countless elements of the new revolutionary consciousness floating all over the world, to unite into a new body and manifest themselves with unexpected force, thus becoming the motive power of a new revolution and welcome upheaval. In the present days there no longer exists unfavorable situations for action in the old sense of the word; the times for the passing-away of Capitalism are ripe and any dead calm may be the forerunner of new social storms rising unexpectedly.

Prompted by these considerations, we lay before all labor unions, all extra-union mass organs, all groups and parties, this suggestion of a general strike of May First 1920 in favor of Soviet Russia, and we beg them to inform us if it will have their support.

For The Amsterdam Bureau of
The Communist International

H. Roland Holst.

APPEAL TO THE BRITISH, FRENCH, AND BELGIAN PROLETARIAT

COMMUNICATION OF THE PROVISIONAL BUREAU OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Proletarians:
In a magnificent onrush the German proletariat has swept away the counter-revolution of the Kappes and the Lüttwitzes. The reaction of the Junkers has been crushed by the dauntless courage of the masses who rose like one man. These working masses, divided against themselves starved and miserably trodden down by the Noske regime, lacking arms, doubted of their ability to achieve, have united in superb fighting movement and have displayed in the decisive instant the most splendid courage and initiative. Without an instant's hesitation the German proletariat has left the factories and the means of transport and the public services; it has procured itself the arms it needed and by means of guns as by means of strikes, combining the two great methods of the class-struggle at the disposal of the working class, it has achieved victory. From the first day, in the midst of the battle against the counter-revolution of the Junkers, another battle has defined itself. Like a flame burning with a fiercer flare in the core of a vast blaze. This flame was the war against the bourgeois regime served by the social-democratic government, the war against capitalist tyranny and oppression, the war for the deliverance of labor from exploitation, for the Soviet system and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the suburbs of Berlin, in Saxony, in Thuringia, in Wurtemberg, in Bavaria, in all Germany, but especially in the Rhine district and the Westphalia, workshop-councils spring up and endeavour to seize the power. The proletarian army, and forth Red Guards. The industrial cities of the West change into as many fortresses, where the social revolution organizes and increases its forces. At the same time the revolutionary wave sweeps across Pomerania and agrarian disturbances break out in Pomerania and Mecklenburg, whilst part of the army, some naval divisions and part of the police refuse to fight against the revolution.
The Ebert Government mad with fear, sees the real enemy, sees Spartacus overthrown, decimated,

crushed over and over again, again raising its head more terrible and threatening than ever. It sees the large masses of the Independent Socialist Party fight on one front with the Communist vanguard. It sees in many places members of the social-patriotic party unite the revolutionary traditions, strikes and the armed struggle. And the fear of the government deepens as it sees the attitude assumed by the bureaucracy of the syndicates which, however much against their will, and only to avoid being submerged by the revolutionary tide, demand the immediate socialization of the mines, the disarming of the troops, the formation of a Central committee of the industrial unions—demands that, although in reality a manoeuvre of the trade-union bureaucracy, shows the concessions the aspirations of the masses demand, the system of Soviets and, unhesitatingly, the Ebert Government decides to fight to the end for the maintenance of the capitalist system. It gathers its forces, it makes front against the announced, it is still maintained a few days longer in office by the majority of the social-democratic delegates to the National Assembly. It assembly allows the counter-revolution of the Junkers take to its quarters and gather its forces in Silesia and Eastern Prussia. The Vendée of Germany and Noske the hangman, the butcher, concentrates all the faithful troops at his disposal against the Rhine district. The Rhine district, the flaming hearts of the Social Revolution, where by the hour it is gaining strength and splendor. It is there that the battle between Past and Future will be decided, the battle between either German Capitalism will receive a mortal stroke, or the grand attempt of the working classes to seize the power will be drowned in a deluge of blood. And whilst tens of thousands of workers in those numerous cities of the Rhine district which form the single immense industrial agglomeration already are sketching out the political forms of the

TO THE COMMUNISTS OF GREAT BRITAIN

COMMUNICATION OF THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BUREAU OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The Sub-Bureau of the Communist International is under the impression, that some misunderstanding prevails about the attitude of the Bureau towards affiliation of Communist groups and parties to the British Labor Party.

A resolution passed at the February Conference in Amsterdam and two letters written to comrades of the I. L. P. have been interpreted differently. It is for this reason, that we wish to accentuate our opinion briefly as follows:

I. In accordance with the resolution mentioned above we are of opinion, that Communists should not be affiliated either directly or indirectly to political organizations that accept the principles of the Second International. For England such an organization no doubt is the Labor Party.

II. We are convinced that the policy of the Labor Party especially if this policy should be successful will lead to a betrayal of the cause of the workers similar to the betrayal of Ebert-Noske, mutatis mutandis.

III. We have stated that affiliation with the Third International of groups that participate in the Labor Party is possible, as is shown by the B. S. P., in so far as they accept Communist principles and tactics, which involves a persistent struggle within the Labor Party against the policy and tactics of this body. We are convinced, that participation in the L. P. if accompanied by Communist criticism and action will only be temporary.

IV. Since we agree with those Communists in England, that object to participation in the Labor Party, we are of opinion, that they should not give up their attitude on the plea of unity. Much as we would like to see a united Communist Party in England it may be better to postpone this ideal than to compromise on important issues.

V. We strongly appeal to our English friends to unite on the basis of no affiliation to the Labor Party, as we clearly see the catastrophe that will follow the coming into power of a parliamentary Labor Government. Warning in advance may help to unite the workers after the failure will become evident under the banner of Communism. To achieve this result it is necessary however to clearly define our attitude towards the methods of the Labor Party. A compromise in such a way that local organizations are allowed to follow a policy that is considered objectionable as a general method, must lead to confusion when accepted by a united Communist Party.

For The Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of
The Communist International

D. J. Wynkoop,
H. Roland Holst,
S. J. Rutgers.

* Italics are ours.—To this particular paragraph we call special attention of all our advocates of "unity at any price." The general principle underlying this paragraph is, in our opinion, applicable and must be applied to the Communist movement in any country, including also the United States. Ed.

new society, whilst they restore order, start anew the public services, organize the first Red Army in Western Europe, the chargé d'affaires in Berlin and France congratulate the Ebert-Noske Government on its victory over the "reaction" and offer their support towards the destroying of the nascent German Republic, even as Bismarck did all but half an age ago, offered his support to Thiers toward the destroying of the Commune.

In face of the common enemy, the social revolution, conquerors and conquered forget their distinctions. The antagonism of their interests disappears before the universal interest of the capitalist class, before its instinct of selfpreservation.

Already Lloyd George, Millerand and Vandervelde have wiped out the score of their differences with the German bourgeoisie. Nay more, in order to save it they are prepared to shed the blood of the British, the French and the Belgian people.

Already British troops at Solingen have helped to crush the Spartacist insurrections.

Already the commanders of the Entente troops have deliberated at Mayence, Foch presiding, on the measures to be taken against the Communist movement in the Ruhr valley.

Already the British chargé d'affaires has informed the German Vice-Chancellor Schiffer that the Entente would not furnish any food-stuffs or raw materials to a German Soviet Republic.

Already the Entente has allowed the troops of the government to traverse occupied territories on their march against the Communist insurrection, and to make use of this territory as a base of operations in the concentrated attack against the Red Army.

The solidarity which unites all bourgeoisies, all militarisms is proclaimed openly, cynically, without any attempt to gloss the matter over. It behooves to proclaim as openly as energetically solidarity of the proletariat.

British, French and Belgian proletarians, will you let your ruling classes make use of you to trample to death the German revolution?

The German revolution—that is just a way of speaking of traditional expression. To speak the truth, there is no German revolution, no more than there is a Russian, or a British, or a French, or an Italian, or a Spanish revolution.

There is only one Social Revolution, as there is only one capitalist oppression, as there is only one Socialism, one hope of the oppressed and exploited of all countries.

They who know that the Republic of Workers' Councils established in Germany means the accord of Germany with Soviet Russia, that is, the marvelous development of the industry and the tech. nical progress, and the immense resources in agrarian products, in fertile land and in minerals of the other uniting, melting one into the other, fecundating each other. They know this accord means the proletarian Revolution, inevitable henceforth by the blockade as by the steel. They know that this accord means the rapid and assured evolution of the Communist production and culture, its radiance growing day by day more luminous, more serene, more irresistible, towards the East, where foul capitalism stinking with corruption and sweating blood, still struggles in a horrible agony. They know that the triumph of the Revolution in Germany will immediately start revolutionary movements in Yugo-Slavia, in Poland, in the Balkans, in Italy, etc. They know that when capitalism Europe in Central Europe, capitalism in Eastern Europe is mortally wounded. They know that Social Revolution is one, and that the crucifix in Germany means crushing it in the germ in their own country.

French, British and Belgian proletarians, will you once more suffer yourselves to be guiled by your (Continued on page 4)

International News

RUSSIA

The Ninth Congress of the Communist Party.

A Soviet radio of April 7th, quoted in "Humanité" on April 16th, gives the following passages from Trotsky's speech at the final session of the Party Congress on the previous day: "The Soviet Army reflects the transitional character of the Soviet régime. The latter is entering today upon a new period of its existence in which the principal weight of its forces is being transferred to the economic front. Consequently, the Red Army must modify itself to correspond to the new phase of development of the Soviet Republic. Obviously, while the country was obliged to carry on a desperate war on all fronts there could be no question of creating a regular militia service, that system exists today only in its embryonic form of universal military training."

The idea of the militia arose at once amongst the bourgeoisie and the Socialists of the Second International. In his book, "L'Armée Nouvelle," Jaures foretold that military army in a democratic republic would little by little come to transform and socialize the mobilized citizens. But the imperialist war, the Revolution, and, finally, the creation of our Red Army, have shown that the character of an army is not determined merely by its form. It was suggested that the militia system would assure the defense of the country at much less cost than the contract of a well-organized militia will be much more costly than a standing army, it only for the reason that it covers infinitely vaster masses of the population. The fact is that the militia system has been simply forced upon the nations by the march of events; this was seen during the late imperialist war, which forced all States to call up class after class, and, in some cases, to multiply tenfold their peace-time effectives. But the principal argument for the militia system is that, to have an army, we must produce, and, in order to produce, we must retain the necessary man-power in the workshops and the fields. The trade unions will certainly play a considerable part in the organization of the army.

If we speak of militarization of Labor, we must also set before ourselves the idea of industrializing our army. A militia is necessary of a territorial character, we must therefore transform its present administrative areas in such a way that they will have as pivot an industrial center. In short, in every area the industrial proletariat will be the basis of the militia. In the present period of transition it is not possible first to demobilize the Red Army and then to create a militia; the two processes will take place simultaneously, and the defensive powers of our Republic will not be weakened for a single day.

Finally, thanks to the militia system, our country will be able at the same time to solve the problems of economic reconstruction and to defense of the Revolution." Trotsky's theses on this subject (reprinted in "The London Call" of April 15th) were unanimously approved.

The Congress was closed by a speech in which Lenin reminded delegates that it was a spirit of strict party discipline which held us up to the present still dominant. He said that the Republic of all its miraculous successes; all efforts could thus be concentrated on one essential task at a time. The same energy and spirit must now be brought to the economic life. This would be a difficult task, but gradually, day by day, and inch by inch, stocks of corn could be replenished, machines repaired, factories going, and the economic problem would be solved just as the military one had been. The workers of all countries were watching Russia and awaiting new victories.

After this speech, on the motion of Preobrazhensky, Lenin's oldest friends, Kamenev, Bukharin, Kallinin, Radek, and Kizanov—addressed the Congress on the subject of the life and work of the leader of the world Revolution, who would on April 16th attain the age of 60. Bukharin called him the most perfect type of logical Marxist theoretician and statesman. "Lenin is exempt from all narrowness of view. His universal spirit seizes in every period the characteristic tendency and gives clear, exact, and considered replies which are always to the point. He has always struggled against the least manifestation of opportunism and has always attacked the least traces of bourgeois spirit." Kallinin attested the affection and respect which all workers cherished towards Lenin, both national, in the Russian working-class movement, and international, as is shown by the revolutionary murmurs which agitate the whole world in reply to Lenin's protests.

In spite of Lenin's protests, these speeches were greeted with a great ovation.

The new Central Committee, elected on the 8th day of the Congress, comprises: Andrelev, Bukharin, Dzerzhinsky, Zinoviev, Kallinin, Kamenev, Krestinsky, Lenin, Preobrazhensky, Rudzutak, Radek, Rakovsky, Rykov, Sergelko, Serebrakov, Smirnov, Stalin, Tomsky and Trotsky.

GERMANY

The Communist Party.

Boris Souvarine, in the course of an article in "L'Humanité" of April 18th, replying to certain statements made by Caussey, the "Humanité" correspondent in Berlin, states that in October, 1919, at its Heidelberg Congress, despite the mass persecutions and suppressions it had suffered, the K.P.D. (Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands) numbered 104,000. At the beginning of March, when in Berlin, he was told by Talkelmer, editor-in-chief of the "Rote Fahne" and collaborator of the "Internationale" (the review founded by Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg) that the terrorized printers refused to print the Communist organs even after a short break in the state of siege had given them for a few days, the possibility of appearing. Before the last suppression of January 13th, one of the two "Rote Fahne" (each of the two Communist anti-parliamentary and syndicalist as well as orthodox—parties has its own), printed by the most primitive methods, had a circulation of 24,000 copies when there was no printing without without printing more. Talkelmer declared that without boasting, the circulation would reach 100,000, if access to modern typographical establishments were not forbidden.

A Fifth International?

The "Vorwaerts," April 18th, has a leading article in which they bewail how misunderstood they (the majority Socialists) are abroad. They note with pleasure the series of articles written by Mistril (a Centre Socialist) after his sojourn in Germany during the Kapp coup in "Humanité" in which he approves in the main of the majority Socialist tactics, but even if it has not the desired effect on the French and other Socialist parties as a whole. Their crying need is an "International" where they could make their views and actions known, and as no one is prepared to help them, they, the majority Socialists, must act on their own. To call together an International, we presume. Whether the second or a "fifth" is not clear from the article. But truly the plight of the

THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY AND THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

Editor's Note: This letter from our International Secretary has just reached us in time for publication. Comrade Fraina is abroad making contact with the Communist movement there and participating in the work of the Third International.

TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE SUB-BUREAU OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

Comrades: The Socialist Party of the United States has decided to affiliate with the Communist International, and has made application accordingly to G. Zinoviev. In considering this application, the following points should be born in mind:

1.—The mere decision to affiliate with the Communist International is in itself of small value; the decisive factor is acceptance, in theory and practice, of Communist fundamentals.

2.—The resolution of the American Socialist Party in favor of affiliating with the Communist International is silent concerning acceptance of the principles and tactics of the Third International. At the last National Convention of the Party, August 20, 1919 (at which, incidentally, the expulsion of 40,000 Communists from the Party, was overwhelmingly mass action, Soviets and proletarian dictatorship as means of achieving the overthrow of the Socialist Party evading every actual problem of revolutionary theory and practice.

3.—The policy of the Socialist Party is completely dominated by the conception of parliamentary conquest of Capitalism. The party is not revolutionary; on the contrary, it is shamelessly opportunist; its tactics consist in dependence upon petty-bourgeois democracy, parliamentarism, reformism and co-operation with the liberals and reactionary trades-unions.

4.—The revolutionary elements in the Socialist Party have either been expelled or have sojourned of the former party membership, approximately 50,000 are now in the Communist Party, 8,000 in the Communist Labor Party, and only 30,000 are left in the Socialist Party. The Socialist Party now consists wholly of the Right and the Centre; opportunists and reformists, all. The dominant personality in the Socialist Party are: Morris Hillquit, an unprincipled, reactionary opportunist; the Longuet type; Victor L. Berger, a social-patriot who, in 1913, urged that the United States should conquer and annex Mexico; Seymour Steadman, a typical petty bourgeois reformist. The expulsion of 40,000 Communists from the party, declared in a capitalist newspaper: "The Socialist Party has been purged of its Bolshevism"; Meyer London, who as a member of Congress, supported the war and was not expelled from the Party; Algonson Lee, who, while a member of the New York City Board of Aldermen, voted to promote the sale of Liberty (war) Bonds; and others. The party is still dominated by the Right and the Centre. Germany "In order to save the Russian Revolution." All the leaders who represented the Socialist Party as a typical party of the old International are still dominant; there has been a purge of the Communists, but not of the opportunists, of the Right and Centre.

5.—The Socialist Party prides itself upon having declared against the war. a) The revolutionists are largely responsible for the anti-war campaign, now out of the party. b) The party's official policy, as expressed by the leaders who are now still dominant in the Socialist Party, was one of petty bourgeois pacifism and neutralism.

6.—The Socialist Party wages a strong campaign against intervention in Russia and for recognition of the Russian Soviet Government; but this campaign is scarcely less sincere than the campaign of the petty bourgeois radicals. Moreover, the Socialist Party neither emphasizes nor appreciates that aspect of the Russian Proletarian Revolution which makes mandatory the revolutionary reconstruction of Socialism.

7.—Five Socialist Party representatives elected to the Legislature of the State of New York have been denied their seats by the Legislature. The Socialists' defense at the trial had three aspects: a) That constitutional government and democracy are menaced by the act of the Legislature; b) that the Socialist Party has no connection with the Communists; c) that it is not the Socialist Party which aims to establish a Soviet Republic in the United States, since favoring the Russian Soviet Republic "does not mean proposing, or even dreaming, that a system which is opposed naturally from Russia's material conditions is adaptable to a highly complex economic system such as that of the United States."

8.—The Government's savage campaign of repression against the Communists does not involve the Socialist Party. In a declaration issued January 23rd, 1920, justifying the repressive campaign of the Department of Justice, Attorney General Palmer said: "Certainly such a campaign is not the business of the Communist Party of America and the Communist Labor Party cannot be construed to fall within the same category as the Socialist Party of America, which latter organization is pledged to the accomplishment of changes in the Government by lawful and rightful means."

9.—The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, in session on March 8, 1920 (two months after the decision to affiliate with the Communist International), revealed three significant facts:

a) That a number of trades-unions had been invited to send delegates to the Party Convention of May 8th—indicating that the Socialist Party is merging more completely in reactionary craft unionism.

b) German majority Socialists is a sad one. Between the social patriots of other countries, who dislike them because they are German, and supported their country in the war, and the Communists of all countries, who denounce them because of their betrayal of the German working class, there is no haven for them except—where they naturally have fallen—in the arms of the German bourgeoisie.

SWITZERLAND

The "Internationals": Dead and Stillborn.

A Berne message to "L'Humanité," of April 16th, states that the American S. P., although affiliated by its recent vote to the Third International, has signified its approval of the Swiss "Reconstruction" proposals. The same message states that Camille Huysmans has convoked the 10th congress of the Second "International" for July 31st at Geneva.

A Communist Conference Forbidden.

The Vand Cantonal Government has forbidden the holding, anywhere within its jurisdiction, of any conference of Communist organizations which has been summoned for April 17th-18th at Yverdon by the Communist group within the Swiss Socialist Party. ("L'Humanité," April 16th, 1920.)

b) That a demonstration for political prisoners was being arranged together with the Freedom Foundation and the National Civil Liberties Bureau—indicating the Socialist Party's co-operation and affiliation with petty bourgeois radicals.

c) That Jean Longuet was to speak in the United States under the auspices of the party—indicating the opportunist and centrist character of the Socialist Party's international affiliations.

10.—Historically, the Socialist Party developed as the American expression of the opportunism and reformism which became dominant in the Second International at the close of the XIX century; the party represented and still represents moderate petty bourgeois Socialism. The decision of this party to affiliate with the Communist International is the product of two factors: a) Undefined sympathy of the party membership with the Russian Revolution and the Soviet Republic; the Communist International being identified with the Soviet Republic and a means of assisting this Republic, instead of as a means of revolutionary struggle and the reconstruction of Socialism. b) The "dilemma" of miserable Left-Center in the Socialist Party, which considers it a "clever stroke" to affiliate with the Communist International imagining that this might impair the power of the Communist Party of America.

The admission of the American Socialist Party to the Communist International would be a serious blow to the American Communist movement and to the International itself.

A serious and menacing situation now prevails in the Communist International. The old International is broken in pieces; in this, the Communist International, which has been performed and is in construction, but the Communist International has not yet performed the constructive task of organizing itself on a definite basis. All sorts of parties and groups formerly affiliated with the International, and which have not purged themselves of the Center and Right, are asking admission to the Communist International; for our International to admit these undesirable elements would mean reconstituting the Second International under the name of Communist International. The situation is dangerous and requires immediate and uncompromising action: the Communist International must double-bolt its doors against undesirable elements; it must do nothing to impair its own revolutionary integrity or to hamper the conscious Communist movement in any particular country.

In the name of the Communist Party of America, accordingly, I call for the rejection of the application of the American Socialist Party for admission to the Communist International; and that, pending final action by the Executive Committee of the International or a Congress of the International, the Sub-Bureau of the International shall not enter into any relations with the American Socialist Party. March 30, 1920.

Lonis C. Fraina,
International Secretary, C. P. A.

APPEAL TO THE BRITISH, FRENCH AND BELGIAN PROLETARIAT

(Continued from page 3.)

ruling classes? Will you be your brothers' murderers? Will you be committing the abominable deed prepare your own destruction for tomorrow?

Or will you profit by the miseries of six years of unheard of sufferings of heart and body? Have you beheld the light that shines out of the East? Has the dawning of a new consciousness? Has it cleansed your soul, and strengthened your heart?

If so, you know what you have to do: to do immediately, to-day; to-morrow might be too late. You must, on a large scale, repeat for your German brothers and with the same determination and vigor, what you attempted to do for your Russian brothers, and, what however is insufficient and weak still has contributed to their salvation.

British Proletarians! Remember the stormy magnificent meetings of the Hamburg Russia Committee. They were a ford for the raising of the blockade.

French Proletarians and Soldiers! Remember the men of the Black Sea Fleet, the dockers of Bordeaux. Their courage has contributed to the defeat of the partisans of military intervention.

Workers of the Entente! Loudly proclaim your solidarity with the German revolution!

Exact from your Governments the withdrawal of the troops from the occupied territory. Railwaymen, refuse to effectuate the transport of any troops or any arms or munitions to Germany.

All of you answer any attempt on the part of your Governments to strangle the German revolution by extending and intensifying your own revolutionary activity. Make it plain to them, that if the international bourgeoisie is one in the defense of its ruined and rotten social order, the international proletariat is one in the heroic struggle for deliverance.

Boldly forward, Comrades! At this instant the fate of the European Revolution depends on you, on your initiative, on your far-sightedness.

Hurrah for the Communist Revolution in Germany! Hurrah for the World Revolution, the Universal Soviet Republic!

The Executive of The Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of The Third International.

D. J. Wynkoop,
Henriette Roland Holst,
G. A. Rutgers.

POLITICAL PARTIES IN GREAT BRITAIN

(Continued from page 2.)

as indicated in my industrial report is of the utmost importance not only to the British and Russian to the International. The leftward movement is to the good but the danger of accepting it uncritically is most marked. Without the international stiffens an emphasis the need for clarity and the acceptance of the full responsibility of its policy, there may be witnessed the swamping of the Third International by the middle-headed leaders of the Second International.

Probably nowhere is the greater danger of this than in Great Britain where social sentiment gives place so much to clear thinking. It is a welcome sign to see the Socialist movement being forced to take itself to task where it has been as sentimental as parochial.

A Communist Party, or two Communist parties may be formed in Britain therefore at an early date. There is a tremendous task before them, even though history is urging things along at a rapid pace.

J. T. Murphy,
S. S. Workers Committees.
Amsterdam, March 1920.

Bolshevism," raised by the Communist Labor Party and by some "persistent voices" within the Communist Party. His only regret is that these protests were "confused"—so far as the Communist Labor Party was concerned, and that they were "plainly stifled" within the Communist Party. He longs for the Left Wing, dreams of that blissful time when he will be "back again in the Left Wing." His whole article, in fact, is a continuous moaning for the Left Wing.

The language federations of the Party, particularly the Russian Federation, were instrumental in the organization of the Communist Party in the United States. This is a well-known and established fact by this time. Comrade Zinoviev, the chairman of the Communist International, in one of his official communications to the Russian Communist Federations—"promulgators of the Communist movement in the United States."

Y. F. undoubtedly also knows and recognizes this fact. But just because of this—he, a sentimental bard of the Left Wing, batters and attacks the Russian Federations. The net result of the Federation leadership has been an absolute pushing backward of the revolutionary Socialist movement in the United States," he indignantly exclaims.

Of course, since the Communist Party has already been organized in this country—"it is assuredly not the desire at this date to quarrel with the fact of the starting of the Communist Party," he tries to reassure us. He is so magnanimous, that he does not even mention—"at this date," that the Convention which the Communist Party was started, had been "packed."

But he "accepted" the Communist Party simply and—well, it seemed to him a good "forum" in which to fight against domination of an aggressive, active, hopeful membership by a small clique of vain politicians.

By the way, Comrade Reader, does this not have a familiar ring to you—this charge of "a small clique of vain politicians" laid by the very same chapeau flung against "Larin and his crew" by the reptile press in "dominating and suppressing the good, kind and generous but simple Russian people?"

He accusation that "an aggressive membership" could be or has been dominated by a "small clique of politicians," certainly sounds just as absurd as the most ridiculous and lying accusations invented against the Bolsheviks by the capitalist press.

While virulently attacking the Federations for their "fight to conquer the Left Wing"—in order to transform it into the Communist Party, our virtuous Left Wing confessor, however, his aim as well as his adherents in the Communist convention and subsequently in the Communist Party was "a Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party"—in other words—re-transformation of the Communist Party into the Left Wing.

"Once in Communist Convention in other words, once such a 'catastrophe' had happened, there appeared no escape from the dilemma except a Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party."

The Federations, and especially the more experienced Russian Federations understood very well and saw through the tricky plans of the "perpetual Left-Wingers"; they realized the danger of a "Left Wing conquest" (or absorption) of the Communist Party, and acted accordingly. But Y. F. and his adherents did not understand and did not know that they and their plans were discovered and thwarted against—and this is precisely why he so "sarcastically" accuses (in his naivety not suspecting even how comically it really sounds) the Federations of applying an "arbitrary calendar test" in the process of the formation of the Communist Party.

No, dear Y. F., though you are a "learned statesman" and "political scientist"—you did not understand then, and still do not understand, that it was not a "calendar test." The question was not of a date, but of the method of formation of the Communist Party. Substantially, there was no difference whether to start it officially on June 22nd or on September 1st, and as matter of fact the Federations shifted the date from the former to the latter—but it was important, and it made a great difference as to how to start the Party. It is one thing to start with a clearly defined, real, Communist Party from, and with a membership, already consciously Communist—who in fact were already Communists—and it is quite a different thing to invite to participation in its formation, and in the formulation of its program and tactics, elements—large numerically but poor in "Communist quality."

But we realize, of course, that such considerations are beyond the understanding of our learned statesman and author.

Having failed in an attempt of a "Left Wing conquest" of the Communist Party at its first convention, and in several similar attempts (in fact, it was one continuous attempt) during the subsequent seven months of the Party existence, our "Lord Varney" and his followers were not discouraged; they found their consolation in the sentence: "defeats are only disastrous when we fail to acquire a new wisdom and a new determination out of them."

And so they decided to arm themselves with "a new wisdom and a new determination," in order to save the Party, and incidentally "liberate" it from the "exotic (read: foreign) domination" by Federations.

"A new wisdom" soon prompted them a proper course of action while a new determination made them ready and willing to accomplish "something really big, something extraordinary."

The Communist movement in the United States has gone backward, since June 1919, "having been retaken" by the "minority group,"—his administrative Sancho Panza—Damon—decided to interpret this statement into action. And, since "the Communist movement has gone backward," when was only natural that he decided to push it "forward."

His recent "step detat" in the C. E. C. and the plan and that decision. It was a deliberate attempt to accomplish the longed-for desire of the "minority" and to return the Party to that delightful primitive stage of "Left Wingism." Had their plan succeeded, there would be—just as in June of last

*Not being a "theoretician" and sneeringly branding as "agent theorists" all those who "constantly talk about principles," Damon, as is well known, is a "man of action" and a "great administrator and organizer." His administrative or organizing genius found its expression in the following profound sentences in his "Statement to the Majority members of the C. E. C. (The most paid Chicago District Organizer, C. E. C. is the most paid man in such a position). . . . He has turned over to the National organization . . . more funds . . . than all the other districts combined. The officials of the S. P. are called "money catchers." Damon may well be called a good "money catcher." And he certainly knows how to catch money. He "appropriated" more than seven thousand dollars of party money and "got away with it."

APPEAL TO THE MEMBERSHIP, ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

(Editor's Note: A part of this call was omitted by some error in the last issue of the Communist. Since it is impossible to reprint the omitted part, by itself we are reprinting the entire call as this is an important official document.)

THE COMING CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY. APPEAL TO THE MEMBERSHIP, ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE C. P. COMRADES:

The Central Executive Committee recognizes the necessity for a party convention in order to settle finally the differences that have been seething within the party for a long time and which came to a climax at last in the form of the present "secession movement" led by the former Executive Secretary and two members of the C. E. C.

The C. E. C. recognizes that the membership also demands a convention for the same reasons. Therefore, this being the earnest and general desire of the party, **THE PARTY CONVENTION MUST AND WILL BE CALLED.**

However, in order to make the convention a success—in order that the convention shall accomplish the necessary task of settling the fundamental issues at stake—IN ORDER THAT THE COMMUNIST PARTY SHALL FUNCTION FOR THE PROPAGATION OF COMMUNISM IN HARMONY WITH THE PROGRAM OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL LAID DOWN BY THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL—without internal dissension paralyzing its activity, and what is most important—in order TO GIVE THE MEMBERSHIP (THE PARTY) AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS THEIR OPINION ON THE ISSUES BEFORE THE PARTY, this convention

year—no organized Communist Party, but only an "unimaginative," diffused Left Wing divided into two groups—majority and minority.

At the end of the first paragraph of his article—of which this is an analysis—Y. F. promises a "continuation." We do not know, whether or not he will fulfill this promise. But even if he should, we doubt whether he will say anything new, whether it will be of any interest to us.

As we stated before, his political identity is now definitely clear to us. Whatever "new" and "interesting" he could have said, is already contained in the first part of his article. His further "written exercises" can only have an "archaeological" or "psychological" interest. They may contain interesting material for a treatise on the "Psychology of a Political Has-Been," but no more than that.

He revealed himself politically, as a "Communist Has-Been." Together with Harold Lord Varney Walling, Spargo and others, he has the dubious honor to belong to a "class" of political "has-beens."

It may be argued that to identify him with Walling and Spargo is a "little too strong." To which we reply, that we do not imply that his apostasy is of the same degree as that of Walling or Spargo, but we do imply that it may be better expressed in a "mathematical formula." The relation of Y. F. to the Communist Party is identical to the relation of Walling and Spargo to the Socialist Party, or of Lord Varney to the I. W. W.

All of them belong to the same political species, all of them should be carefully shelved and listed in a museum of "political has-beens."

Regrettable, however, is it that so many comrades—many in good and sincere Communist spirit, perhaps—still do not understand this "has-been" character of Y. F. and of the "minority group" whom he represents.

Some of our comrades, are still, due to misunderstanding, misinformation or misinterpretation, on the side of the "minority," serving the latter as a sort of "gunfodder" in its fight against the Communist Party. But even among the comrades who are on the side of the majority, or rather of the Communist Party, some Communists though they be—we hear from time to time (but more and more seldom though, it is true), voices in favor of "requesting Damon and Spargo to return to the C. E. C. and continue to work under the control and supervision of the C. E. C."

The comrades voicing these "requests" and "demands" in their honest and sincere devotion to the Communist Party do not realize that neither Damon nor Y. F. and other leading figures of the "minority" group do belong any longer to the Communist Party, and for that matter—to the Communist movement in general. They do "invite" them back into the Communist ranks sounds just as naive and sentimental, if not to say ridiculous—as for instance, to "invite" Hilqu or Onal into the Communist ranks!

We want, in this connection, to emphasize a real, definite, revolutionary Communist Party without any "Centrist" taint about it. It was for such a Communist Party that we split away from the Socialist Party, that we (for overwhelming majority of us) bolted from the United Left Wing Conference and separated ourselves from the Centrist "Communist Labor" elements. Are we now going to destroy the results of this long and painful process of building the Communist Party? Are we now going to "invite" back to our ranks those "Centrists," who just because of their "Centrism"—have themselves voluntarily left us? No, comrades! It is high time to understand, that whatever might be said of its desirability or practicability at that particular moment, months before the convention, now, since the split has already occurred, we have no reasons to regret its occurrence.

"Prematurely," perhaps, having occurred earlier than it would have otherwise, this split liberated us from the "Centrist" elements who handicapped our Communist work, and, if anything, we must rejoice about it.

It is high time to understand that the return of all these "Centrist" elements into the Communist Party (granting for the sake of argument, that such an absolutely impossible thing could have occurred) would be a decided step backward. It would really push our Party and the Communist movement backward in this country by at least

All these considerations and the desire to bring them to the attention of the comrades prompted us to write this article. Though devoted to "one individual" only—as it might appear on the surface—this "face individual" being the leading "theoretician" of the "minority group"—was important to prove conclusively to the comrades and his followers "Centrist" character.

*Not speaking even of the utter inconsistency of inviting "back to his post" former Executive Secretary Damon, a man who so shamelessly betrayed his trust and the confidence placed in him!

must be well-prepared and carefully arranged. The time, the place, the method of electing the delegates, and, above all, instructions to the delegates are essential prerequisites in order to make this convention accomplish its purpose.

This means, first of all, that before the convention is called, the membership must be given an opportunity to discuss all the issues so that, when the time comes for the election of delegates, they will not elect them blindly, but on an informed, GENTLY-AND WISELY ONLY FROM THEIR OWN OPINION ON THE ISSUES IN THE CONVENTION.

All this requires time for preparation—preparation for the process of elections in the various states and the technical arrangements connected with these and the convention itself, both by the membership and the Central Executive Committee. If called too soon, without the proper time for preparation as stated above, the convention would only result in failure and necessitate the calling of another convention a few months after this convention to settle the issues which a hurried convention will inevitably fail to accomplish.

Moreover, this convention should be called only by the Central Executive Committee of the Party, as the only legally elected body which, between conventions, can speak with authority in the name of the Communist Party and its membership as a whole. This is the only means of maintaining a centralism and discipline upon which a real strong Communist Party can be built.

Therefore, we call upon the membership to repudiate the so-called convention called by the former Executive Secretary Damon, which as we will show is nothing but a trap set for the rank and file. The date itself, as fixed in the call issued by the former Executive Secretary implies no real desire to have any convention at all.

In the first place, the former Executive Secretary had no right or mandate to call this convention. The duty of the Executive Secretary, as defined by the Convention, is to work only under the supervision and control of, and in conjunction with, the Central Executive Committee. He is only the executor of the decisions of the body, or where a division exists, of the majority of that body, and is responsible only to the Central Executive Committee, which is, in turn, responsible to the convention.

Secondly, the date set in the call issued by the former Executive Secretary, May . . . for elections of intermediary units and May . . . for national convention, even were it technically possible, would give no chance to the membership to discuss the issues involved.

While pretending that they represent the membership and that they want to give them the opportunity to express themselves at the convention, the "minority" in fact, is deliberately arranging the convention so as to prevent the membership from any possibility of expressing themselves. The date fixed by them implies that they are deliberately arranging their convention so as to force the membership to elect their delegates blindly. In other words, they are simply deceiving the membership.

But it is obvious that it is physically impossible to have the elections and the convention at the date set in the call of the "minority." Conventions are not called at a week's notice! This is so self-evident, that even the "minority," however ignorant or party quack they may be, cannot pretend to be unfamiliar with it. Most surely they knew it, but still they purposely fixed this impossible date as a sort of "bribe" to the membership in an attempt to swing them away from the Communist Party and its Central Executive Committee, over to their side by offering them an "earlier" date. The very fact that in the letter to the C. E. C. requesting joint action on the question of the national convention, the "minority" express a willingness to change the date and other details already fixed by them, indicates clearly that they themselves did not take their own call and its fixed date for the convention seriously.

In the meantime, the "minority" do not hesitate to use the party funds in the possession of the former Executive Secretary, entrusted to him by the C. E. C. to appoint paid District Organizers in every District, even where District Organizers appointed by the C. E. C. are still functioning, in order to build up rival organizations in all the party units—TO CAPTURE THE DELEGATES FOR THEIR SIDE. In other words, to break the very foundations of the Communist Party—ITS REVOLUTIONARY DISCIPLINE.

But we know that the membership will answer the "minority" and in no uncertain terms. They will not be led into the trap set for them. They will refuse to go into a "convention" called by these "secessionists" and disrupters. They will dismiss as irrelevant and hypocritical the cry of "factional control" raised by the "minority" against the C. E. C.

The rank and file will, first of all, carefully discuss the issues involved—WILL TAKE SIDES and elect their delegates accordingly in order to settle the issues at the convention called by the Central Executive Committee. At present, the "next order of business" before the membership is to make up those issues, discuss them and understand them. And the C. E. C. urges every party unit to this "order of business."

It is necessary that every group should have this discussion, before the sub-district and district conventions are held, not after them, for it is exactly these preliminary discussions that determine the CHARACTER AND COMPOSITION OF THE NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTION!

DO NOT ELECT SUB-DISTRICT AND DISTRICT DELEGATES NOW!

The call for the party convention will be issued by the Central Executive Committee; setting the time, place, district and district conventions, details and methods of elections.

The C. E. C. will set a date for the convention after inquiries from, and consultations with, the District Organizers and the Executive Committees of all party units, so that the date will be finally fixed will be physically possible and convenient for all party units to participate.

THIS CALL WILL BE ISSUED SOON.

STAND BY THE PARTY! YOU STAND BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY BY REPUDIATING THE CALL ISSUED BY THE FORMER EXECUTIVE SECRETARY. SIGNATURE THIS CONGRATULATE YOURSELVES WITH THE DISTRICT ORGANIZATIONS UNDER THE CONTROL AND DIRECTION OF THE C. E. C. FOR THE CALL TO BE ISSUED BY THE C. E. C.

IN THE MEANTIME DISCUSS THE ISSUES. TRY TO UNDERSTAND THEM SO THAT YOU WILL BE ABLE TO ELECT THE DELEGATES WHO REPRESENT YOUR POINT OF VIEW. (Continued on page 8.)

THE MINORITY HAS BEEN SMOKE OUT

(Continued from last issue)

Federations.

The question of the federation issue is a puzzling one to the membership because the "minority" still camouflages its objective—the abolition of federations. To prove this we will have to analyse what they aim at—not what they say. First, the "minority" believes that dues—stamps should be sold to the federation branches only through the District Organizations and not through the Central Executive Committees of the Federations. Second, the "minority" holds that the future development of the party lies in the direction of "shop units."

The first plan the "minority" claims would make for more efficiency in the administrative work of the party. Let us see. What strikes us first is that this method is THE ONE ACCEPTED BY THE C. L. P. the most rabid anti-federationists we have come across. What strikes us next, is that this plan is now being advocated by the very ones who have been opposed to federations for years. The former Executive Secretary has never made a secret of his opposition to federations and at every opportunity he has attempted to limit or circumscribe their authority and autonomy. At the C. E. C. meeting he made the motion to change the method of paying dues with the explanation that "this was the first step in the process of the abolition of federations." So, if we take all these factors into consideration, we find that this is not simply an administrative detail BUT BEHIND IT LURKS A DEEPER AND DEADLIER PURPOSE.

When this fact is recognized, the next question that arises is, can the process of abolishing the federations be begun at this time? Especially when this step is undertaken by Centrists and opportunists who do not really belong in the Communist Party and who are taking a short cut out by "splitting" away themselves. Admitting as the "majority" has always maintained, that the future organization of the federations and their relation to the party must be built on a more centralized basis, it is undeniably true, that the time has not yet arrived when this process can be effected. The federations, as at present constituted, are the carriers and promulgators of Communism in this country and they have not yet completed their function in the American Communist Party in this regard. In the process of fulfilling this function the Federations will gradually "die out" thus making it unnecessary to destroy them artificially.

The language federations—especially the Russian Federations—are the foundation stones of the Communist Party. Without them there would be no Communist Party in this country at the present time.

In this pre-revolutionary epoch, while the American working class is as yet hostile or indifferent to Communism, while the economic and political conditions have not yet awakened the revolutionary spirit in the masses, the only elements who are making supreme sacrifices to keep the party functioning and spread its propaganda are the "foreign comrades" of the language federations. It is the "foreign comrades," who, working through their federations, bear the brunt of the struggle and strife. They give of their time, energy and money unstintingly. This no one can deny.

The "foreign comrades" cannot, most of them, speak or understand English. Abolish the federations and their machinery for keeping their units functioning, and these "foreign comrades" are cut off from their only expression and articulation; they become easy prey for any English elements who wish to carry on their own kind of propaganda without hindrance from any organized "foreign elements" who know what Communism really means and can exercise control over those who attempt to work contrary to their conception of Communist principles and tactics.

Now as to the "shop units" which the "minority" only hint at, but for some reason or another, best known to themselves, are afraid to elaborate. Perhaps when we expose this second proposition the readers will understand the reason too.

The innocent term "shop units" carries with it an idea which aims at the complete transformation of the Communist Party as at present constituted into "shop branches" only as the future form of the Communist Party.

This would destroy, not only the Federations,

but the very political composition and character of the Communist Party itself. What the future of the party would be, organized on this industrial basis, we can leave to the imagination of the rank and file. Those comrades who know of the shop branches in the Bolshevik movement in Russia, and their function and their utility in the Bolshevik organization, know the great danger of the purely trade-union psychology predominating over the larger political perspectives in their shop-branches. Rather were they elementary branches, so to speak, whose contact with the political organization was similar to the idea of Communist Party shop branches as advocated in the program of the Communist Party and adopted at the last convention. Such shop committees, composed of members of the Communist Party, to carry on Communist propaganda and agitation in the shops and industries directly, must be under the control of the party. But, to transform the entire party into shop branches, destroying completely the political organization, is a Centrist conception that could only have been born in the minds of Centrists, casting about for a way of getting "contact with the masses" at any cost, even at the expense of destroying the conserver of Communism itself—the political organization of the Communist Party.

Naturally, with such an object before them, the necessity of beginning the process of destroying the federations can be understood when emanating from the "minority."

This proposition is the clue to the "minority's" attitude toward federations, even were all other signs ignored. And all their smooth phrases to the contrary notwithstanding; they DO INTEND TO FORCIBLY ABOLISH THE FEDERATIONS.

to let the federations decide for themselves at the convention what the future form of federations shall be, that is so much poppy-cock. The Federations did decide at the last convention and the "minority" later raised the charge of "packing" the convention. Should the federations again decide at the next convention—and their decision run counter to the "minority's,"—they will again raise the cry of "packing" the convention.

But the Federations will not be so foolish as to entrust their future into the hands of its enemies, particularly, when those enemies are Centrists at the same time, who have no clear, consistent conception of Communism or its application.

The examples of the Hungarian and Jewish Federations do not speak well for the "minority's" position. Any federation membership that permits itself to be led out of the Communist Party by its Executive Committee is not a Communist membership AND DOES NOT BELONG IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE FIRST PLACE. (This holds true for that part of the membership which is following the "minority" out of the Communist Party.) The Jewish comrades, on the contrary, are not following the lead of their Executive Committee in remaining "neutral" (suspended in the air) but are taking their places according to their composition—Communists lining up with the C. E. C. and the Centrists with the "minority."

Summary

To sum up. The "minority" have been smoked out into the open and forced to expose their conception of Communist principles and tactics upon which we disagree so fundamentally. Having done this, they have revealed themselves to be opportunists and Centrists with a bourgeois-Socialist ideology.

On the question of Unity with the C. L. P. we have proved—and the facts as printed in the previous issues of the Communist have borne us out—that the "minority" are mere whining sentimentalists who, Centrist-like, always seek unity with Centrist elements, but cannot tolerate or work together with real Communist elements as represented by the C. E. C. They sought to effect immediate amalgamation with the C. L. P. disregarding the differences between the two organizations—and disregarding the elemental consideration in Communist unity—ACCEPTANCE AND PRACTICE OF COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES. They never looked beyond the mere technical advantages of gaining more organizers, writers and speakers and ignored all else.

On the question of International Delegates and Relations with the Third International we have proved conclusively that their conception of international relations is on a par with that of

Morris Hilquit and the conceptions of the Second International. We have also proved that they disobeyed the decisions of the convention on this question.

On the question of Mass Action, they have a confused Centrist conception which in nowise differs from that of the C. L. P. or the I. W. W. or even the S. L. P. and S. P. insofar as propagating the idea of the inevitability of a violent revolution to the workers is concerned.

As for the charge that the "majority" have carried on a campaign against Lenin as a compromiser, that is such a low, contemptible lie, that we do not even deign to answer it. There is a limit to which even Communists can descend to answer the slanders of an opponent!

On the question of federations, we have proved that their object is the complete abolition of them despite their smooth evasions and indirect insinuations to the contrary.

On the question of Shop Units or Shop Branches we have further proved their desire for the elimination of federations as well as pointing out the Centrist, opportunist character of such a project.

On the question of legality, as they call it, we have proved that they lack the very first element of Communist understanding of revolutionary centralization and discipline.

On the question of splitting the party we have developed the facts sufficiently in the last statement and the present article to disprove their evasions and lies as well as their mechanical conception of splits in general and this one in particular.

The "minority" stands convicted on every count.

They have proven themselves to be a set of revolutionary charlatans, cowardly compromisers and ignorant Centrists. They have merely taken advantage of a temporary and unusual situation where the former Executive Secretary, having all the funds and property of the party in his possession, have carefully prepared a coup d'etat on a flimsy pretext hoping to crush the C. E. P. whom they hated bitterly, and drive them from the party before the convention, or to force such terms upon them as would make the next convention a farce insofar as setting the real fundamental issues between the "majority" and "minority" were concerned.

This also explains their hasty call for their convention, set for a ridiculously early date, in order to make it impossible for the membership to discuss and understand the issues and elect delegates on the basis of such intelligent understanding.

But their coup failed. Without funds and party machinery the C. E. C. immediately set to work and has built up a strong organization that will be able to withstand the splitting away of some Centrist elements that never really belonged in the party at all; at best, they should have been in the C. L. P.

The Communist Party is gaining and will gain immeasurably from the lessons taught it by this split.

News From Europe

R U S S I A

More "Missions" to Russia.

The Czechoslovak Government, according to "L'Humanité" of April 15th, has replied to Chicherin's last note, assuring the Soviet Government of its sincere friendship towards the Russian people. It has decided to send a special mission to Russia to study the question of economic relations "as well as many other problems."

The "Imparcial" announces that a commission, composed of three delegates—one on behalf of the Government, one for the employers, one for the workers (a Socialist M. P. Fernandez Rios)—will shortly leave Spain for Russia to study the "social, political, and economic situation" of the Soviets.

White Guards Negotiating?

According to the Stockholm paper, "Folks Dagbladet," says "L'Humanité" of April 15th, the White General Wrangel has opened negotiations with the Soviet Government.

I T A L Y

The General Strike in Turin.

The Turin correspondent of "L'Humanité" stated, on April 16th, that the general strike had just begun, and attributed its origin to the following causes. The workers, in agreement with the Unions and the Party, have organized factory councils (commissions) internally everywhere; the employers have consequently begun a struggle against the new organizations with the object of divesting them of all economic authority—as the strength of the Turin workers is so great that in many factories they have actually been able to control production.

To bring about the limitation of the powers of the Works Councils, the employers proposed a system of labor contracts, which would set a basis to their future development. This actually brought about the conflict, in which the railwaymen have spontaneously joined. The workers have published in "Avanti" a conciliatory statement of the conditions under which they wish the principle of factory councils to be applied.

PROBLEMS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

By N. LENIN

(Continued from page 1.)

And therefore I was so deeply grieved by the Moscow Manifesto, which was at least premature and certainly useless. And I hope that my French comrades, who have been buffeted about during the last four hapless years by so many slanders and misfortunes, will not succumb to a fit of impatience, and will not also help to split the International solidarity.

Otherwise your children will have to reconstruct this solidarity if the proletariat are ever to rule the world.

JOHN RAMSEY MACDONALD

The author of the above article, as the reader can see, is attempting to prove that a split is not necessary. On the contrary, just its inevitability follows from the line of argument of Ramsay MacDonald's typical representative of the Second International, worthy colleague of Scheideemann and Kautsky, Vandervelde and Branting, etc., etc.

The article of Ramsey MacDonald is the best sample of those smooth, well-sounding stereotyped phrases, Socialist in appearance, which in all advanced capitalist countries have served for a long time to screen bourgeois policies within the working class movement.

1

Let us begin with the least important but peculiarly characteristic. As Kautsky (in his pamphlet "Dictatorship of the Proletariat") the author repeats the bourgeois lie, that in Russia nobody forsook the role of the Soviets, that I and the Bolsheviks began the struggle with Kerensky only in the name of the Constituent Assembly.

This is a bourgeois lie. As a matter of fact, on April 4th, 1917, on the very first day of my arrival in Petrograd, I already introduced "theses" demanding the Soviet, and not the bourgeois, parliamentary republic. I repeated this many times during the Kerensky premiership both in print and at meetings. The Bolshevik Party emphatically and officially announced this in the resolutions of their Conference on April 20th, 1917.

Not to know this means—not to want to know the truth of the Socialist Revolution in Russia. Not to understand that the bourgeois parliamentary republic with the Constituent Assembly is one step forward as against the same republic without the Constituent Assembly, and that the Soviet Republic is two steps forward in comparison with it,—means to close one's eyes to the difference between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

To call oneself Socialist and not to see this difference, two years after the introduction of this question in Russia, one and a half years after the victory of the Soviet Revolution in Russia,—means that one remains stubbornly in absolute enslavement to "public opinion of non-Socialist elements," i. e. to the ideas and policies of the bourgeoisie.

With such people the split is necessary and unavoidable, because it is impossible to carry on the work for the Socialist Revolution hand in hand with those who are pulling on the side of the bourgeoisie.

And if men such as Ramsey MacDonald, Kautsky and others, did not want to overcome even such a really insignificant "difficulty," for such "leaders," as of informing themselves from the documents on the attitude of the Bolsheviks

to Soviet power and on the treatment of this question before and after November 7th, 1917, would it not be ridiculous to expect from such men the readiness and ability to overcome the incomparably greater difficulty connected with the present struggle for the Socialist Revolution? None so deaf as those who will not hear.

2

Let us proceed to the second lie (out of countless lies with which Ramsey MacDonald's article is full of, for in this article there are perhaps more lies than words). This lie is perhaps the most important.

John Ramsey MacDonald claims that the International before the war 1914—18 said only that "when war takes on the character of national defense the Socialists should co-operate with other parties."

This is a monstrous, repugnant deviation from the truth.

Everybody knows that the Basle Manifesto of 1912 was unanimously accepted by all Socialists and that this is the only one of the documents of the International which deals exactly with the very war between the English and German groups of imperialist beasts, which, as known to all, was being prepared in 1912 and finally broke out in 1914. Just in reference to this war the Basle Manifesto expounds three points, upon which MacDonald remaining silent, commits the greatest crime against Socialism and proves that with men of MacDonald type the split is necessary, because they actually serve the bourgeoisie and not the proletariat.

These three points are the following:

The impending war can find no justification by even a shadow of interest of national freedom;

It would be a crime for workers to shoot each other in this war;

The war leads toward the proletarian revolution.

These are the three fundamental truths, "forgetting" which (though he subscribed to them before the war) MacDonald ACTUALLY goes over to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, proving thereby that the split is necessary.

The Communist International will not unite with parties, which do not wish to recognize these truths and are not capable of proving by their deeds their determination, readiness and ability to inculcate these truths into the minds of the masses.

The Versailles Peace has proven even to fools and blind people, even to the mass of shortsighted, that the Entente was and remains the same bloody, bullying, imperialist beast as Germany. Only hypocrites or liars, deliberately introducing bourgeois policies, direct agents and tools of the bourgeoisie, labor lieutenants of the capitalist class (like the American Socialists) or, men who have fallen under the spell of bourgeois ideas and bourgeois influence so that they are Socialists only in words but actually are petty-bourgeois philistines and sycophants of the capitalists could fail to see this. The distinction between the first and second categories is important only from the point of view of personalities, i. e. for the appraisal of John or Peter in the social-patriotic ranks of all countries. From the political point of view, i. e. from the point of view of the relations of millions of people, of the relations of classes this distinction is of no importance.

The Socialists, who during the war of 1914—19 did not understand that on both sides, a criminal reactionary, robbers', imperialist war,—are Social-Chauvinists, i. e. Socialists in words and chauvinists in fact; friends of the working class in words, but in fact lackeys of "their" national bourgeoisie, helping them to deceive the masses by picturing as "national," "liberating," "defensive," "just," etc., the war between the English and German groups of imperialist plunderers, who are equally rotten, corrupt, bloody and criminally reactionary.

Unity with Social-Chauvinists is a betrayal of the revolution, betrayal of the proletariat, betrayal of Socialism, desertion to the side of the bourgeoisie,—because, it is a "unity" with the national bourgeoisie of "their" country against the unity of the international revolutionary proletariat—it is a unity with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

The war of 1914—18 has finally proven this. Whoever cannot understand this can remain in the yellow Berne "International" of social-traitors (From the "Communist International," No. 4.)

(To be continued.)

A LETTER FROM CHICAGO

(Editor's Note: This letter was received soon after the split, but for lack of space was not printed in the last issue. The inference drawn in this letter about "unity" with the "left elements" of the C. L. P. together with the C. L. P. is more than a wild guess. Certain facts recently come to light and touched on editorially, make this more than a mere conjecture of the author. When all the facts are in, we have no doubt they will prove that the plot to split the Communist Party was hatched in the office of the C. L. P. between their representatives and the representatives of Damon & Co.)

Scarcely eight months have passed since the Communist Party was founded. The formation of the organization not yet finished—the paths of its activities still new and untrodden—and already a crisis is at hand. A SPLIT is here.

This, no doubt, is agitating the mass of the membership, and is observed with satisfaction from the camps of our enemies.

Naturally, everybody wants to know the cause. Is it really impossible for those who appeal to all workers in all lands for solidarity and unity—for those who claim to recognize proletarian dictatorship and armed insurrection—to live and work together in harmony?

Very important reasons must be shown by those who stand for a split at this moment: who take upon themselves this great responsibility at the moment when the Third International comes out with a proposal for unity into one party. Communist elements which stand outside—chiefly in the ranks of the Communist Labor Party

The National Executive Secretary together with two other members of the Central Executive Committee have taken upon themselves this responsibility, as against the other members of the C. E. C.—an overwhelming majority of ten. Yet the Secretary had the funds of the party, the addresses and other connections, which were all seized by the "minority" and helped them greatly in the disorganizing of the party.

The Secretary claims to be acting quite properly, because, elected directly only by the Convention, he says, he will be responsible only to a convention. But the funds were entrusted to him not by the Convention, but by the Central Executive Committee—for the sake of greater efficiency. Why doesn't he return them where they belong? Well,—because "the majority has means enough—from the Language Federations remittances..." (as stated by the Secretary himself).

The split is still more unjustified because the next convention of the Party was right at the door. The split was brought about for an obvious purpose—the "minority" on their backs attempted to arrange this convention in order to turn over the Communist Party into hands of the Communist Labor Party.

The "minority" claims that the break was forced not by any theoretical or tactical differences, but by minor details, which taken separately were quite a big heap during the last eight months. For example, the Secretary questions the right of the C. E. C. Committee to remove District Organizers whom he had appointed; he is dissatisfied with the sending of delegates to Europe (to meetings of the Third International), although such delegates were elected at the September Convention; and other minor matters.

But, neither individually, nor all together, can they justify the split. What kind of a Central Executive Committee would it be, which could not appoint or remove its agents (the District Organizers) entirely according to its own discretion and necessity? How could such a Committee discharge the trust placed in it by the Convention if it should not let them work each according to his own will and sometimes against the decisions of the Central Executive Committee?

A mistake was already made at the September Convention, when, besides the Central Executive body there was elected another independent executive power in the person of the Secretary. It appears that there has been more or less friction right along between these two powers.

Just now the split is in the process of developing fully—from the top down to the bottom—to the sub-districts, branches and groups. Good wishes, good intentions, hysterical moralizations cannot stop it—the split has a logic of its own and it must run its course.

It is very possible, that together with the Secretary of the Communist Party will go those elements, who by their sympathy already stand with the C. L. P. In the triumvirate of the "minority" there is, for example, a member who took part in the so-called Anarcho-Menshevik Russian Conference (Jan. and Feb. 1919), and who was so characterized even by Gregory Weinstein—at that time, editor of the *Novy Mir*.

A similar division is noticeable on the real issues and principles involved, it can be foisted in advance that the Communist Party of America will emerge from this crisis clarified and strengthened. If Centrist elements split off, it is only a desirable process.

Let us not forget the conclusions arrived at by the International Conference in Holland, namely, that "opportunists (to which belong all Centrists without exception—St. R.) are the most dangerous enemies of the proletarian revolution when in their tendency they lean toward the Left."

Therefore, it is well that they go. It would be a bad thing for the movement only in case—by various hooks and crooks—the Centrists should get away with them some really Communist elements. That would be a real loss.

This argument about Centrists is not an invention but an actual fact. One of the members of the C. E. C., a close friend and partner of the Secretary, had resigned some time ago for the reason that he could not get used to the new conditions in the Party. He represented the so-called "legalist" group, and he is with the "minority."

Further, the Communist Labor Party in their official organ express satisfaction at the split and really invite the "minority" into the ranks. They write in their May issue, among other things, as follows: "Unity between this (the splitting-off minority) and the C. L. P. should come very shortly."

And so, the right wing of the Communist Party will unite with the left wing of the Communist Labor Party—and we shall have something like the Independent Socialists in Germany. The right wing of the C. L. P., however, in all probability, obeying the invitation of Debs, will go back to the old Socialist Party, which, you know, has also decided to join the Third International, and has applied for a charter. In the extreme Left there will remain the Communist Party—the only representative of Bolshevism in the revolutionary working class movement of America.

St. R.

NEWS FROM EUROPE

FRANCE

To the Strains of the "International."
Recently-mobilized recruits of the 1920 class write to "La Vie Ouvrière," of April 16th, as follows:—From Metz: "The departure from the Gare the 12th took place amidst the strains of the 'International.' From Toul: 'I have seen in a Nancy paper that the 1920 class was joining up with enthusiasm. This is a little too strong.' From Paris to Nancy we sang the 'International.' All the time our captain was saying that all the Parisians were Bolsheviks." On Thursday, while we were going through Nancy, our officers wanted to make us sing 'Maddon.' We all said we didn't know it." Another writes: "We left singing, certainly, but not the 'Marseillaise.' On our arrival and at departure, in all the stations—Chateau-Thierry, Châlons, Bar-le-Duc, Commercy, the 'International' was chanted, broken every now and then by cries of 'Down with the Army!'"

The Young Socialists in Congress.

At the recent Congress of the Young Socialists of Switzerland, held at Aarau, it was decided to proclaim the complete autonomy of the organization, and to affiliate immediately to the Young Communists' International—"Le Populaire," April 17th, 1920.

U. S. to R. L. A. N. D.

